

# SHIFTED TABLEAU SWITCHINGS AND SHIFTED LITTLEWOOD-RICHARDSON COEFFICIENTS

SEUNG-IL CHOI, SUN-YOUNG NAM, AND YOUNG-TAK OH

**ABSTRACT.** We provide two shifted analogues of the tableau switching process due to Benkart, Sottile, and Stroomer; the shifted tableau switching process and the modified shifted tableau switching process. They are performed by applying a sequence of specially contrived elementary transformations called *switches* and turn out to have some spectacular properties. For instance, the maps induced from these algorithms are involutive and behave very nicely with respect to shifted Young tableaux whose reading words satisfy the lattice property. As an application, we give combinatorial interpretations of Schur  $P$ - and Schur  $Q$ -function identities. We also demonstrate the relationship between the shifted tableau switching process and the shifted  $J$ -operation due to Worley.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The (tableau) switching process, introduced by Benkart-Sottile-Stroomer [1], is an algorithm which takes a pair  $(S, T)$  of semistandard Young tableaux such that  $T$  extends  $S$ , and moves them through each other, yielding a pair  $({}^S T, S_T)$  of semistandard Young tableaux such that the outer border of  ${}^S T$  coincides with the inner border of  $S_T$ . It has been one of the fundamental tools in the study of Young tableaux and their applications to Schubert calculus, representation theory, geometry, and so on. Particularly it unifies the previously defined switching algorithms due to Haiman [7], James-Kerber [8], Remmel [11], Shimozono [16] and provides nice combinatorial interpretations of Schur function identities. Naively speaking, this algorithm may be viewed as a mixture of Schützenberger’s jeu de taquin [13] and its inverse process in the sense that the map induced from the algorithm is involutive and  ${}^S T$  is the rectification of  $T$  when  $S \cup T$  is of normal shape. Here the rectification of  $T$  is the unique Young tableau of normal shape whose reading word is Knuth equivalent to that of  $T$ .

The purpose of the present is to provide two shifted analogues of the switching process; *the shifted (tableau) switching process* and *the modified shifted (tableau) switching process*. The former is an algorithm which takes and yields a pair of shifted Young tableaux, whereas the latter takes and yields a pair of semistandard

---

This research was supported by NRF Grant #2012R1A1A2001635 and NRF Grant #2015R1D1-A1A01056670.

2010 MSC: 05E05

Keywords: shifted tableau switchings, shifted jeu de taquin, Schur  $P$ - and Schur  $Q$ -functions, shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficients

shifted Young tableaux. Here a semistandard shifted Young tableau means a shifted Young tableau with no primed entry on the main diagonal.

We construct the shifted switching process by mimicking the strategy of [1]. We first establish the notion of shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pairs and then contrive the following seven elementary transformations called *switches* to interchange two letters in a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair:


$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{(S1)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S2)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \text{(S3)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S4)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & a \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \text{(S5)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S6)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b \\ \hline \mathbf{a} & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \text{(S7)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & a & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

The above switches are so designed that they recover the shifted slides used in the shifted jeu de taquin when  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes are viewed as empty boxes. Here the shifted jeu de taquin, introduced by Worley [19] and Sagan [12] independently as the shifted analogue of Schützenberger's jeu de taquin, is an algorithm which takes a shifted Young tableau and yields another shifted Young tableau with the same weight, but different shape.

Applying (S1) through (S7) in succession, we obtain the shifted switching process on the set of shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pairs  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . The most crucial step here is to show that the shifted perforateness is being maintained throughout this process (Proposition 3.3). Keeping this process, we finally obtain an algorithm which takes a pair  $(S, T)$  of shifted Young tableaux such that  $T$  extends  $S$ , and moves them through each other, yielding a pair  $({}^S T, S_T)$  of shifted Young tableaux such that  $S_T$  extends  ${}^S T$  (Theorem 3.9). It should be pointed out that unlike the switching process, our shifted switching process depends on the order of inner corners to which switches are applied (Remark 3.7).

The shifted switching process so obtained has many similarities with the switching process. For instance, the map induced from the shifted switching process, called *the shifted tableau switching*, is involutive (Theorem 4.3). Its proof, contrary to the case of the switching process, is far from being obvious since our shifted switching process depends on the order of inner corners. And, when  $S \cup T$  is of normal shape, we can see that  ${}^S T$  coincides with the rectification of  $T$ , the unique shifted Young tableau of normal shape whose reading word is shifted Knuth equivalent to that of  $T$ . For other similarities, see Section 4.

Despite of the above good properties, the shifted switching process is rather unsatisfactory in that the shifted tableau switching cannot be reduced to a bijection on the set of pairs  $(S, T)$  of semistandard shifted Young tableaux such that  $T$  extends  $S$  since the shifted jeu de taquin does not necessarily take a semistandard shifted Young tableau to another semistandard shifted Young tableau. In more detail, if a switch is applied to the following  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes



then the resulting pairs have a primed letter on the main diagonal. To avoid this phenomenon, we introduce the following three *modified switches*:

$$(S1') \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a & b' \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b & a' \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (S2') \begin{array}{|c|} \hline a' \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|} \hline b' \\ \hline a \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (S6') \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a' & b \\ \hline b & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & b \\ \hline a & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We construct the modified shifted switching process by applying (S1'), (S2') and (S6') in the above three cases and (S1) through (S7) in the other cases exactly in the same way as the shifted switching process has been defined. We first verify that the shifted perforateness is being maintained throughout the modified shifted switching process when it is applied to any shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$  and no primed letters are on the main diagonal of  $A \cup B$  (Proposition 6.1). Once the modified shifted switching process is established, we show that the induced map, called *the modified shifted tableau switching*, is involutive (Theorem 6.4). It would be very nice to develop a modified version of shifted jeu de taquin which plays the same role as that of the shifted jeu de taquin in the shifted switching process.

Main applications of our shifted tableau switchings concern Schur  $P$ - and Schur  $Q$ -function identities. Let  $P_\lambda(x)$  and  $Q_\lambda(x)$  respectively denote the Schur  $P$ - and Schur  $Q$ -function associated with a strict partition  $\lambda$ , and  $P_{\nu/\lambda}(x)$  and  $Q_{\nu/\lambda}(x)$  the Schur  $P$ - and Schur  $Q$ -function associated with a skew shape  $\nu/\lambda$ . Letting  $P_\lambda(x)P_\mu(x) = \sum_\nu f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu P_\nu(x)$ , it is well known that  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  counts shifted Young tableaux  $T$  of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  such that

- (a)  $w = w(T)$  satisfies the lattice property;
- (b) the rightmost  $i$  of  $|w|$  is unmarked in  $w$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\mu)$ ).

These tableaux are called *Littlewood-Richardson-Stembridge (LRS) tableaux*. Using the shifted switching process we give combinatorial interpretations of  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = f_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$  and  $Q_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_\mu f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu Q_\mu(x)$ . On the other hand, letting  $Q_\lambda(x)Q_\mu(x) = \sum_\nu g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu Q_\nu(x)$ , it can be easily seen that  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  counts semistandard shifted Young tableaux  $T$  of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  satisfying the condition (a). These tableaux are called *modified Littlewood-Richardson-Stembridge (LRS) tableaux*. Compared with LRS tableaux, the study of modified LRS tableaux is not yet well established. In the best knowledge of the authors, even the combinatorial interpretation of  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = g_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$  has not been known. Using the modified shifted tableau switching we here give its combinatorial interpretation and also that of  $P_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_\mu g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu P_\mu(x)$ .

Finally we remark that there have already been two operations similar to the shifted switching process. The one is due to Buch-Kresch-Tamvakis [2], who exploited sliding unmarked and marked holes in any LRS tableau to construct a bijection between NW and SE holed LRS tableaux. These slides can be viewed as switches by identifying o-holes with  $a$ -boxes and o'-holes with  $a'$ -boxes. Although some of the switches obtained in this way are different from our switches, it is quite interesting to note that the sliding paths [2] are exactly same to our shifted switching paths. This fact plays a crucial role in the proof of Lemma 3.14. The other is about the shifted  $J$ -operation due to Worley [19]. He utilized this operation intensively to show the symmetric identity  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = f_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$  and properties about the coefficients of

expansions involving  $Q_{\lambda/\mu}$ . We demonstrate the relationship between the shifted switching process and the shifted  $J$ -operation in case where  $S \cup T$  is of normal shape (Theorem 5.6).

The present paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we collect the definitions and notation necessary to develop our arguments. In Section 3, we introduce the shifted tableau switching and its properties. To do this we first define the shifted switching process on shifted perforated pairs (Algorithm 3.4). Using this we define the shifted switching process on pairs of shifted Young tableaux (Algorithm 3.8). Section 4 is devoted to applications of the shifted tableau switching. In Section 5, we provide a shifted analogue of the generalized evacuation in [2] and redescribe the shifted switching process in the spirit of the shifted  $J$ -operation. The final section is devoted to the modified shifted tableau switching and its applications.

## 2. DEFINITIONS, TERMINOLOGIES, AND NOTATION

In this section, we collect definitions, terminologies and notation required to develop our arguments. More details can be found in [2, 5, 12, 17, 19].


For a strict partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_\ell > 0)$ , let the *length*  $\ell(\lambda)$  of  $\lambda$  be the number of positive parts of  $\lambda$  and the *size*  $|\lambda|$  of  $\lambda$  the sum of positive parts of  $\lambda$ , that is,  $\ell(\lambda) = \ell$  and  $|\lambda| = \sum \lambda_i$ . Let  $\Lambda^+$  denote the set of all strict partitions.

For  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ , define the *shifted shape*  $S(\lambda)$  of  $\lambda$  by

$$\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : i \leq j \leq \lambda_i + i - 1, 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\lambda)\}$$

and the *main diagonal* of  $S(\lambda)$  by  $\{(i, i) \in S(\lambda) : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\lambda)\}$ . For  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$  for all  $i \geq 1$ , we write  $\lambda \supseteq \mu$  and let  $|\lambda/\mu|$  denote  $|\lambda| - |\mu|$ . In this case, the *skew shifted shape*  $S(\lambda/\mu)$  is defined to be  $S(\lambda) \setminus S(\mu)$ . Particularly when  $\mu = \emptyset$ ,  $S(\lambda/\mu)$  is understood as  $S(\lambda)$ . Throughout this paper, the elements of  $S(\lambda/\mu)$  are visualized as boxes in a plane with matrix-style coordinates and  $S(\lambda/\mu)$  is frequently denoted by  $\lambda/\mu$ . A *component* of  $\lambda/\mu$  is defined to be a maximal connected subset of  $\lambda/\mu$ .

A skew shifted shape is called a *border strip* if it contains no subset of the form  $\{(i, j), (i + 1, j + 1)\}$  and a *double border strip* if it contains no subset of the form  $\{(i, j), (i + 1, j + 1), (i + 2, j + 2)\}$ . Note that border and double border strips are allowed to be disconnected. For instance,



For two boxes  $(i, j)$  and  $(k, l)$  in a skew shifted shape,  $(i, j)$  is said to be *north* of  $(k, l)$  if  $i \leq k$ , and *northwest* of  $(k, l)$  if  $i \leq k$  and  $j \leq l$ . When  $i = k - 1$  and  $j = l$ ,  $(i, j)$  is said to be the *neighbor to the north* of  $(k, l)$ . The other directions and neighbors can be defined in the same manner.

Let  $X$  be the set of the ordered alphabets  $1' < 1 < 2' < 2 < \dots$ . When we wish to refer to a letter without specifying whether it is primed or not, we will write  $\mathbf{k}$  for letters  $k$  or  $k'$ . Let  $|\mathbf{k}|$  denote the unprimed letter  $k$ .

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ .

(a) A *shifted Young tableau*  $T$  of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  is a filling of  $\lambda/\mu$  with letters in  $X$  such that

- the entries are weakly increasing along each row and down each column,
- each column contains at most one  $k$  for each  $k \geq 1$ , and
- each row contains at most one  $k'$  for each  $k \geq 1$ .

(b) A *semistandard shifted Young tableau*  $T$  of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  is a shifted Young tableau satisfying the following extra condition:

- there is no primed entry on the main diagonal.

Given a filling  $T$  of skew shape, we write  $\text{sh}(T)$  for the shape of  $T$  and  $|T|$  for the size of the shape of  $T$ . Let  $T_{i,j}$  be the entry of  $(i, j)$  in  $T$ . We call  $(i, j)$  an *a-box* in case where  $T_{i,j} = \mathbf{a}$ .

For a shifted Young tableau  $T$ , let the *weight*  $\text{wt}(T)$  of  $T$  be  $(\text{wt}_1(T), \text{wt}_2(T), \dots)$ , where  $\text{wt}_i(T)$  is the number of occurrences of  $i$  and  $i'$  in  $T$ . In particular,  $T$  is *standard* if its weight is  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$  and it has no primed letter. The weight generating function  $x^T$  of  $T$  is defined to be  $\prod_{i \geq 1} x_i^{\text{wt}_i(T)}$ . The *maximum* (resp., *minimum*) of  $T$ , denoted by  $\max(T)$  (resp.,  $\min(T)$ ), is defined to be the largest integer (resp., smallest integer)  $i$  such that  $\text{wt}_i(T)$  is positive.

Throughout this paper, we will use the following abbreviations and notation.

- SYT: shifted Young tableau
- SSYT: semistandard shifted Young tableau
- $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda/\mu)$ : the set of all SYTs of shape  $\lambda/\mu$
- $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda/\mu)$ : the set of all SSYTs of shape  $\lambda/\mu$

If  $\nu \subseteq \mu \subseteq \lambda$ , we say that  $\lambda/\mu$  *extends*  $\mu/\nu$ . When  $\lambda/\mu$  extends a single box  $B$ ,  $B$  is called an *inner corner* of  $\lambda/\mu$ . It should be distinguished from a *removable corner* of  $\lambda/\mu$ , which is a box in  $\lambda/\mu$  such that neither neighbor to the south nor to the east is in  $\lambda/\mu$ .

When  $T_1$  is an SYT of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  and  $T_2$  an SYT of shape  $\gamma/\delta$  such that  $\text{sh}(T_1) \cap \text{sh}(T_2) = \emptyset$ , we can naturally consider  $T_1 \cup T_2$ , which is the object obtained by drawing  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  in a plane simultaneously. For an SYT  $T$ , let  $T^{(i)}$  be the tableau of border strip shape consisting of all  $\mathbf{i}$ -boxes in  $T$ . If  $\max(T) = m$ , then  $T$  is expressed as  $T^{(1)} \cup T^{(2)} \cup \dots \cup T^{(m)}$ . For instance, if

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & 2' & 2 \\ \hline 1' & 2' & 2 & & \\ \hline & 2' & 3' & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

then  $T = T^{(1)} \cup T^{(2)} \cup T^{(3)}$ , where

$$T^{(1)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline 1' & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T^{(2)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 2' & 2 \\ \hline & 2' & 2 & \\ \hline & 2' & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T^{(3)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 3' & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

In the obvious way we can extend the definition of  $T^{(i)}$  to an arbitrary filling  $T$  of shape  $\lambda/\mu$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $T$  be an SYT.

- (a) We define the *standardization* of  $T$ , denoted by  $\text{stan}(T)$ , to be the standard SYT obtained from  $T$  by replacing all  $1$ 's with  $1, 2, \dots, k_1$  from top to bottom, and next all  $1$ 's with  $k_1 + 1, k_1 + 2, \dots, k_1 + k_2$  from left to right, and so on. Here  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  denote the number of occurrences of  $1'$  and  $1$ , respectively.
- (b) We define the *reverse standardization* of  $T$ , denoted by  $\text{stan}^*(T)$ , to be the filling of  $\text{sh}(T)$  obtained from  $\text{stan}(T)$  by replacing  $i$  with  $|T| - i + 1$ .

For example, if

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & 2' \\ \hline 1' & 1 & & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array},$$

then

$$\text{stan}(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & 3 & & \\ \hline 6 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{stan}^*(A) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 6 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 5 & 4 & & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

We close this section by introducing shifted jeu de taquin and shifted Knuth relations. In 1963, Schützenberger [13] introduced a remarkable combinatorial algorithm, called *jeu de taquin*, which takes a skew semistandard Young tableau to another skew semistandard Young tableau with the same weight, but different shape. This can be accomplished by applying the jeu de taquin slides in succession:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \nearrow & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a & \text{ } \\ \hline b & c \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } a < b \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \text{ } & a \\ \hline b & c \\ \hline \end{array} & & \searrow & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b & a \\ \hline \text{ } & c \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{if } a \geq b \end{array}$$

In the 1980's, Worley [19] and Sagan [12] independently introduced the shifted analogue of Schützenberger's jeu de taquin, which is a combinatorial algorithm taking an SYT to another SYT with the same weight, but different shape. This can be carried out by applying the shifted jeu de taquin slides described in Figure 1 (for short, shifted slides) in succession.

Given an SYT  $T$  of skew shape, one can apply shifted slides to  $T$  iteratively to get an SYT of normal shape (which means no more shifted slides are possible). This can be done in many different ways, but the resulting SYT of normal shape is known to be same for all possible choices. This SYT is called the *rectification* of  $T$  and denoted by  $\text{Rect}(T)$ .





FIGURE 1. The shifted slides

**Example 2.3.** The following shows how the shifted jeu de taquin is being proceeded.



Here the shaded boxes denote inner corners.

We say that two SYTs are *shifted jeu de taquin equivalent* if they can be changed into each other by a sequence of shifted slides, with their inverses, if and only if they have the same rectification. As in the ordinary case, shifted jeu de taquin equivalence can be described in terms of shifted Knuth equivalence. Given any word  $u = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n$  in  $X$ , the possible shifted Knuth relations that can be applied to  $u$  in order to form another word are

- replace  $xyz$  by  $zxy$  or vice versa if  $x < y \leq z$ ,
- replace  $yxz$  by  $yzx$  or vice versa if  $x \leq y < z$ ,
- for the last two elements of  $u$  we may
  - replace  $xy$  by  $yx$  or vice versa if  $|x| \neq |y|$ ,
  - replace  $xx$  by  $x'x$  or vice versa.

Here,  $(x')'$  denotes  $x$  for an unprimed letter  $x$ . Shifted Knuth equivalence of words, denoted by  $\equiv_{\text{SK}}$ , can induce the equivalence relation on the set of words in  $X$  in such a way that  $u$  and  $v$  are *shifted Knuth equivalent* if one can be transformed into the other under the relations above. For more information, refer to [12].

For any filling  $T$  of skew shape, the *word of  $T$* , denoted by  $w(T)$ , is defined to be the word obtained by reading entries from right to left, starting with the top row in  $T$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** ([12, 19]) *Given two SYTs, they are shifted jeu de taquin equivalent if and only if their words are shifted Knuth equivalent.*

### 3. THE SHIFTED TABLEAU SWITCHING

**3.1. The shifted tableau switching.** We here introduce the shifted version of the tableau switching given in [1]. For this purpose we first introduce the notion of shifted perforated tableaux.

**Definition 3.1.** For a double border strip  $\theta$ , a *shifted perforated  $a$ -tableau*  $A$  in  $\theta$  is a filling of some of the boxes in  $\theta$  with  $a', a \in X$  satisfying the following conditions:

- no  $a'$ -boxes are placed to southeast of any  $a$ -box,
- each column of  $A$  contains at most one  $a$ ,

- each row of  $A$  contains at most one  $a'$ , and
- the main diagonal of  $A$  contains at most one  $\mathbf{a}$ .

Define the *shape*  $\text{sh}(A)$  of  $A$  by the subset of  $\theta$  consisting of all  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes. For a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{a}$ -tableau  $A$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ -tableau  $B$  in  $\theta$ ,  $(A, B)$  is called a *shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair of shape  $\theta$*  if  $\theta$  is the disjoint union of  $\text{sh}(A)$  and  $\text{sh}(B)$ . For a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  of shape  $\theta$  we can consider  $A \cup B$  in the obvious way. For instance,

$$A = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & & 1 \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline & 1 & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

form a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ -pair of  $(6, 3, 2)/(2)$  and

$$A \cup B = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1' & 1 & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

We say that  $B$  *extends*  $A$  if  $\text{sh}(B)$  extends  $\text{sh}(A)$ .

As the tableau switching in [1], our shifted tableau switching can be performed by applying a sequence of elementary transformations called switches. Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair. Interchanging an  $\mathbf{a}$ -box and a  $\mathbf{b}$ -box in  $A \cup B$  is called a *switch* if it is subject to the following rules.

- The case where an  $\mathbf{a}$ -box is adjacent to a unique  $\mathbf{b}$ -box:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(S1)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S2)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \text{(S3)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S4)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & a \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

- The case where an  $\mathbf{a}$ -box is adjacent to two  $\mathbf{b}$ -boxes:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(S5)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} & \text{(S6)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b \\ \hline \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b \\ \hline \mathbf{a} & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \text{(S7)} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & a & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

An  $\mathbf{a}$ -box in  $A \cup B$  is said to be *fully switched* if it can be switched with no  $\mathbf{b}$ -boxes. If every  $\mathbf{a}$ -box in  $A \cup B$  is fully switched, then  $A \cup B$  is said to be *fully switched*.


**Remark 3.2.** (i) The shifted slides in FIGURE 1 can be recovered from the above switches by viewing  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes as empty boxes.

(ii) The switches (S3), (S4), and (S7) denote the diagonal switches.

(iii) The switches (S3), (S4), and (S7) cannot be expressed as a composition of two other switches. For instance, (S7) is different from the composition of (S6) and (S1).

(iv) In the switches (S3), (S4), and (S7), one may think in such a way that the  $(i, i)$   $\mathbf{a}$ -box on the main diagonal is moved directly to the  $(i+1, i+1)$  box. However, to define the shifted switching path later, it would be more desirable to think in the

fashion that in case of (S3), the  $(i, i)$  box is moved to the east and then to the south and in cases of (S4) and (S7), the  $(i, i + 1)$  box is moved to the south and then the  $(i, i)$  box to the east. Refer to the following figure:



Let  $T$  be a filling of double border strip shape with letters  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ . Suppose that  $T$  is not fully switched. Choose the easternmost  $a$ -box in  $T^{(a)}$  which is the neighbor to the north or west of a  $\mathbf{b}$ -box if such an  $a$ -box exists. Otherwise, choose the southernmost  $a'$ -box which is the neighbor to the north or west of a  $\mathbf{b}$ -box. Denote this box by  $\square(T)$ . Then we apply the adequate switch among (S1) through (S7) to  $\square(T)$  and denote the resulting filling by  $\sigma(T)$ . Let us apply this process in succession until  $\sigma^n(T)$  gets fully switched, where  $\sigma^i(T)$  is inductively defined by  $\sigma(\sigma^{i-1}(T))$  for  $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ . For simplicity, let us call the process from  $T$  to  $\sigma^n(T)$  the *shifted (tableau) switching process*. When  $T = A \cup B$  for a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$ , we write  $A_B$  for  $\sigma^n(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  and  ${}^A B$  for  $\sigma^n(A \cup B)^{(b)}$  to respect the notation in [1].

From now on, we will only consider a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $A \cup B$  is not fully switched. As the following example shows,  $(\sigma(A \cup B)^{(a)}, \sigma(A \cup B)^{(b)})$  is not necessarily a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair.

$$A \cup B = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a & b' \\ \hline b & a \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S5)} \sigma(A \cup B) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & a \\ \hline b & a \\ \hline \end{array}$$

This problem, however, does not arise in practice in case where  $B$  extends  $A$ . Going further, we can state the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Suppose that  $\sigma^n(A \cup B)$  is fully switched for some positive integer  $n$ . Then  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)$  is still a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair for all  $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .*

The proof of Proposition 3.3 will appear in the subsection 3.2. By virtue of Proposition 3.3, we can provide the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 3.4.** (The shifted switching process on shifted perforated pairs) Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ .

**Step 1:** Start with  $A \cup B$ .

**Step 2:** If  $A \cup B$  is fully switched, finish the algorithm.

If  $A \cup B$  is not fully switched, apply  $\sigma$  to  $A \cup B$ . Put  $A := \sigma(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  and  $B := \sigma(A \cup B)^{(b)}$ , and then go to **Step 1**.

Given two SYTs  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , we say that  $T_2$  *extends*  $T_1$  if  $\text{sh}(T_2)$  extends  $\text{sh}(T_1)$ . Then the following theorem can be stated.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Then we have*

(a)  ${}^A B \cup A_B$  has the same shape as  $A \cup B$ .

(b)  $A_B$  extends  ${}^A B$ . In addition,  $A_B$  and  ${}^A B$  are SYTs of border strip shape.

**Proof.** (a) The assertion follows from the fact that every switch does not affect on the shape.

(b) Since  $B$  extends  $A$ ,  $B$  is clearly an SYT of border strip shape. On the other hand, by Remark 3.2(i),  ${}^A B$  can be obtained by applying a sequence of shifted slides to  $B$ . Here the order in which we choose inner corners is given by  $\text{stan}^*(A)$ . This tells us that  ${}^A B$  is an SYT of border strip shape and  $A_B$  extends  ${}^A B$ . In addition, by Proposition 3.3,  $({}^A B, A_B)$  is a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a})$ -pair and particularly  $A_B$  is a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{a}$ -tableau of border strip shape. From this it follows that  $A_B$  is an SYT of border strip shape.  $\square$

**Example 3.6.** Let

$$A = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline 1 & 1 & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & & 1' & \\ \hline & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then  ${}^A B \cup A_B$  can be obtained from  $A \cup B$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & 1' & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1' & & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S5)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1' & & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S1)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1' & & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S5)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1' & 1 & & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \xrightarrow{(S2)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1' & 1 & & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S3)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 1 & & \\ \hline & & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S5)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 1 & & \\ \hline & & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \xrightarrow{(S6)} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 1' & & \\ \hline & & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

**Remark 3.7.** (i) Algorithm 3.4 heavily depends on the order in which we choose  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes. For instance, in the below, if the switch (S6) is applied to the  $a'$ -box in the first row, then we have

$$A \cup B = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & a' & b \\ \hline & a & b' & \\ \hline & & b & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S6)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & b' & b \\ \hline a & a' & & \\ \hline & & b & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Notice that the resulting filling is not a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair.

(ii) There is a slight difference between the slides in [2] and our switches. For the clarity, denote the slides in [2] by  $\dashrightarrow$ . Let us consider the following shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pairs:

$$U = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a' & a \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad V = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a' & a & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Under the identification of o-holes with  $a$ -boxes and  $a'$ -boxes with  $o'$ -holes, these pairs are transformed by the sliding process given in [2] as follows:

$$U' = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' \\ \hline & a \\ \hline \end{array} \quad V' = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b & a' \\ \hline & a & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

On the contrary,  $U$  and  $V$  are transformed by our switching process in the following form:

$$U'' = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' \\ \hline & a' \\ \hline \end{array} \quad V'' = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b & a' \\ \hline & a' & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

It should be pointed out that  $U$  and  $V$  cannot be recovered from  $U'$  and  $V'$ , respectively, by applying  $\vdash \cdots \rightarrow$  since

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' \\ \hline & a \\ \hline \end{array} \vdash \cdots \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a & a \\ \hline & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b & a' \\ \hline & a & \\ \hline \end{array} \vdash \cdots \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & a' & b \\ \hline & a & \\ \hline \end{array} \vdash \cdots \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a & a & b \\ \hline & & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

But, by applying our switches, they can be recovered from  $U''$  and  $V''$ , respectively. In fact we will prove in Section 4 that our shifted tableau switching is an involution (see Theorem 4.3).

(iii) Given a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$ , let us identify  $a'$ -boxes and  $a$ -boxes with  $o'$ -holes and  $o$ -holes, respectively. Let  $(\overline{A}B, \overline{A}B)$  be the shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a})$ -pair obtained through the sliding process given in [2]. In case where neither  $U$  nor  $V$  presented in (ii) does not occur in the middle of the sliding process, one can easily verify that  $({}^A B, A_B)$  is exactly equal to  $(\overline{A}B, \overline{A}B)$ . However, if either  $U$  or  $V$  occurs, then  $A_B$  is different from  $\overline{A}B$  although  ${}^A B$  is still equal to  $\overline{A}B$ . The difference between  $A_B$  and  $\overline{A}B$  lies in that the former has a primed letter in the southernmost box on the main diagonal, whereas the latter has an unprimed letter therein.

(iv) The definition of the sliding process presented in [2] tells us that  $\overline{A}B = \overline{\text{stan}(A)B}$  and  $\text{stan}(\overline{A}B) = \overline{\text{stan}(A)_B}$ . It follows that  ${}^A B = \text{stan}(A)B$  and  $\text{stan}(A_B) = \text{stan}(A)_B$ . In case where neither (S4) nor (S7) does not occur in the shifted switching process,  $A_B$  is also equal to  $A_{\text{stan}(B)}$ . This is, however, not necessarily true as seen in the following example:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a' & a & b \\ \hline & & \mathbf{b} \\ \hline \end{array} \rightsquigarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{b} & b & a' \\ \hline & a' & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a' & a & 2 \\ \hline & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightsquigarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & a' \\ \hline & & a \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(v) Suppose that  $(A', B)$  is a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A'$ . If  $\text{stan}(A) = \text{stan}(A')$ , then  $\text{stan}(A)_B = \text{stan}(A')_B$  and therefore  $\text{stan}(A_B) = \text{stan}(A'_B)$  by (iv).

Now we are ready to present the shifted switching process.

**Algorithm 3.8.** (The shifted switching process on pairs of SYTs) Let  $(S, T)$  be a pair of SYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S$ .

**Step 1:** Let  $m = \max(S)$  and  $n = \max(T)$ .

**Step 2:** Set  $i := m$  and  $j := 1$ .

**Step 3:** Apply Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(i)}, T^{(j)})$ .

**Step 4:** If  $j = n$ , then go to **Step 5**. Otherwise, go to **Step 3** after setting  $j := j + 1$ .

**Step 5:** If  $i > 1$ , then go to **Step 3** after setting  $j := 1$  and  $i := i - 1$ . Otherwise, finish the algorithm.

Let  $(S, T)$  be a pair of SYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S$ . Suppose that  $\max(S) = m$  and  $\max(T) = n$ . By abuse of notation, we write  $S \cup T$  as

$$S^{(1)} \dots S^{(m)} T^{(1)} \dots T^{(n)}$$

and the filling obtained by applying  $\sigma^k$  to  $S^{(m)} \cup T^{(1)}$  in  $S \cup T$  as

$$S^{(1)} \dots S^{(m-1)} \sigma^k \left( S^{(m)} T^{(1)} \right) T^{(2)} \dots T^{(n)}.$$

When  $S^{(m)} \cup T^{(1)}$  gets fully switched after applying a sequence of switches, we write the resulting filling as

$$S^{(1)} \dots S^{(m-1)} T^{(1)} S^{(m)} T^{(2)} \dots T^{(n)}.$$

In the inductive manner we can write

$$S^{(1)} \dots S^{(r-1)} \sigma^k \left( S^{(r)} T^{(1)} \right) T^{(2)} \dots T^{(n)} S^{(r+1)} \dots S^{(m)}$$

for the filling obtained from  $S^{(1)} \dots S^{(r)} T^{(1)} \dots T^{(n)} S^{(r+1)} \dots S^{(m)}$  by applying  $\sigma^k$  to  $S^{(r)} \cup T^{(1)}$ . When  $S^{(1)} \cup T^{(n)}$  gets fully switched after applying a sequence of switches, the process is finished. We write  $S_T$  and  ${}^S T$  for the fillings that  $S$  and  $T$  respectively become when the above process is applied to  $S \cup T$ . With this notation, we define the *shifted (tableau) switching*  $\Sigma$  by the map sending  $(S, T)$  to  $({}^S T, S_T)$ . When  $S \cup T$  has multiple components, each of them is switched independently according to Algorithm 3.8. The next theorem is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $(S, T)$  be a pair of SYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S$ . The shifted tableau switching  $(S, T) \mapsto ({}^S T, S_T)$  satisfies the following.*

- (a)  ${}^S T \cup S_T$  has the same shape as  $S \cup T$ . In addition,  $S_T$  (resp.,  ${}^S T$ ) has the same weight as  $S$  (resp.,  $T$ ).
- (b)  $S_T$  extends  ${}^S T$ . In addition,  $S_T$  and  ${}^S T$  are SYTs.

**Proof.** (a) The assertion follows from Theorem 3.5(a) and Algorithm 3.8.

(b) In the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.5(b), Remark 3.2(i) implies that  ${}^S T$  is an SYT of skew shape and  $S_T$  extends  ${}^S T$ . Set  $m := \max(S)$  and  $n := \max(T)$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $S^{(i)} \neq \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Now we will prove by induction on  $m$  that  $S_T$  is an SYT.

When  $m = 1$ ,  $S^{(1)} (= S)$  is an SYT of border strip shape. Therefore by applying Theorem 3.5(b) repeatedly, we can see that  $S^{(1)} (= S_T)$  in  $T^{(1)} \dots T^{(n)} S^{(1)}$  is an SYT of border strip shape. Next we assume that the desired result holds for all SYTs  $S$  with  $\max(S) \leq k$  which is extended by  $T$ . Let  $(S', T)$  be a pair of SYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S'$  and  $\max(S') = k + 1$ . Applying the same argument as in case where  $m = 1$ , one can see that  $S'^{(k+1)}$  in  $S'^{(1)} \dots S'^{(k)} T^{(1)} \dots T^{(n)} S'^{(k+1)}$  is an SYT of border strip shape. Then our induction hypothesis implies that  $S'^{(1)} \dots S'^{(k)}$  in  $T^{(1)} \dots T^{(n)} S'^{(1)} \dots S'^{(k)} S'^{(k+1)}$  is an SYT which is extended by  $S'^{(k+1)}$ . Consequently  $S'^{(1)} \dots S'^{(k)} S'^{(k+1)} (= S'_T)$  is an SYT.  $\square$


**Example 3.10.** Let

$$S = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 2' & \\ \hline & 2 & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & & 1' & \\ \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & & 2 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$


Applying Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(2)}, T^{(1)})$  in yields that

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & 2' & 1' & \\ \hline 2 & 1' & 1 & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S1)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & 2' & 1' & \\ \hline 1' & 2 & 1 & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S1)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & 2' & 1' & \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 2 & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S5)} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & 1' & 1 \\ \hline & 1' & 2' & \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 2 & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$


Similarly, applying Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(2)}, T^{(2)})$  in  $S^{(1)}T^{(1)}S^{(2)}T^{(2)}$  yields that



Next, applying Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(1)}, T^{(1)})$  in  $S^{(1)}T^{(1)}T^{(2)}S^{(2)}$  yields that




(see Example 3.6). Finally, applying Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(1)}, T^{(2)})$  in  $T^{(1)}S^{(1)}T^{(2)}S^{(2)}$  yields that



This shows that

$$S_T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1' & 1 & 2 & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad S_T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 1 \\ \hline & & 1' & \\ \hline & 1' & 2' & \\ \hline & 1 & 2 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

**Remark 3.11.** (i) In our shifted switching process, the order in which we choose the boxes to apply switches is very important. For instance, given a box, we may apply switches to that box as many times as possible. The resulting filling obtained in this way need not be a pair of SYTs. Refer to the following example:



(ii) When we are given a filling of the form

$$\dots S^{(i)}T^{(j)} \dots S^{(k)}T^{(l)} \dots,$$

the shifted switching process on  $(S^{(i)}, T^{(j)})$  and that on  $(S^{(k)}, T^{(l)})$  do not affect on each other, thus the order in which we apply Algorithm 3.4 to them does not matter.

As a consequence, the following algorithm produces the same result as Algorithm 3.8.

**Algorithm 3.12.** Let  $(S, T)$  be a pair of SYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S$ .

**Step 1:** Let  $m = \max(S)$  and  $n = \max(T)$ .

**Step 2:** Set  $i := m$  and  $j := 1$ .

**Step 3:** Apply Algorithm 3.4 to  $(S^{(i)}, T^{(j)})$ .

**Step 4:** If  $i = 1$ , then go to **Step 5**. Otherwise, go to **Step 3** after setting  $i := i - 1$ .

**Step 5:** If  $j < n$ , then go to **Step 3** after setting  $j := j + 1$  and  $i := m$ . Otherwise, finish the algorithm.

**3.2. Proof of Proposition 3.3.** We provide two auxiliary lemmas for the proof of Proposition 3.3. To do this we need the notion of the shifted switching path. Suppose that  $(A, B)$  is a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . For each  $\mathbf{a}$ -box in  $A \cup B$ , define its *shifted switching path* by the set of boxes it passes through during the shifted switching process. Particularly when the switch (S3) is applied to a box on the main diagonal, say the  $(i, i)$  box, in the middle of the shifted switching process, the corresponding shifted switching path is understood as  $\{\dots, (i, i), (i, i + 1), (i + 1, i + 1), \dots\}$  (for the preciseness, refer to Lemma 3.13). Denote by  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  the shifted switching path starting from the  $\mathbf{a}$ -box positioned at  $(i, j)$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  the endpoint of  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$ . For instance, when  $A \cup B = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1}' & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\ \hline & & \mathbf{1}' & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ , we can obtain

the fully switched pair  $\sigma^5(A \cup B) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{1}' & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\ \hline & \mathbf{1} & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ . Thus  $\vec{P}_{(1,2)} = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4), (1, 5), (1, 6)\}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(1,1)} = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}$ . Moreover,  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(1,2)}) = (1, 6)$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(1,1)}) = (2, 2)$ .

**Lemma 3.13.** Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Then the shifted switching path  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  corresponding to the  $(i, j)$  box in  $A$  has one of the following forms:

**T1:**  $\{(i, j), \dots, (i, j + y)\}$  for some  $y \geq 0$

**T2:**  $\{(i, j), \dots, (i + x, j)\}$  for some  $x \geq 1$

**T3:**  $\{(i, j), (i, j + 1), (i + 1, j + 1)\}$

**Proof.** For our purpose it suffices to show that no paths contain a subset of the following types:

**E1:**  $\{(s, t), (s + 1, t), (s + 1, t + 1)\}$

**E2:**  $\{(s, t), (s, t + 1), (s, t + 2), (s + 1, t + 2)\}$

**E3:**  $\{(s, t), (s, t + 1), (s + 1, t + 1), (s + 2, t + 1)\}$

We first consider the case where the  $(i, j)$  box in  $A$  is  $\square(A \cup B)$ . When  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  contains **E1**, the  $(s, t + 1)$  box is contained in  $B$ . If it is filled with  $b'$ , then  $(s, t + 1)$  should be in  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  regardless of the letter in the  $(s + 1, t)$  box. But this cannot occur since  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  contains **E1**. Therefore the  $(s, t + 1)$  box is filled with  $b$ , which is also a contradiction since the  $(s + 1, t + 1)$  box in  $A \cup B$  is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$ . When  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  contains **E2**, the  $(s, t + 1), (s, t + 2), (s + 1, t), (s + 1, t + 1)$  and  $(s + 1, t + 2)$  boxes should be contained in  $B$ . This cannot occur since  $B$  is an SYT of border

strip shape. Finally the case where  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  contains **E3** can be treated in the same way as above.

Next we consider the case where the  $(i, j)$  box in  $A$  is not  $\square(A \cup B)$ . We can treat the case where the  $(i, j)$  box in  $A$  is  $\square(\sigma^k(A \cup B))$  by applying the above argument to  $\sigma^k(A \cup B)$  instead of  $A \cup B$ . On the other hand, when the  $(i, i)$  box in  $A$  is moved to the  $(i, i+1)$  position by either (S4) or (S7), it cannot be  $\square(\sigma^k(A \cup B))$ . But in this case the  $(i, i+2)$  box is empty or filled with  $b$ , which implies that the  $(i+1)$ st row consists of only one **b**-box. It follows that  $\vec{P}_{(i,i)}$  should be horizontal.  $\square$

Let  $P$  be a set of boxes in the shifted diagram, and let  $A$  be a box in this diagram. We say that  $P$  lies to the *north* of  $A$  if each box in  $P$  is strictly to the north of  $A$ . The other directions can be defined in the same manner.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Suppose that the shifted switching path  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  occurs directly after the shifted switching path  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$ . Then the following hold.*

(a) *Suppose that  $A_{i,j} = A_{s,t} = a$ . When both  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  are  $a$ -boxes,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the west of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . When  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  are an  $a$ -box and an  $a'$ -box, respectively, we have the following two cases:*

- *If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching processes corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  simultaneously, then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ .*
- *If either (S4) or (S7) occurs only in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$ , then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the west of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ .*


(b) *Suppose that  $A_{i,j} = a$  and  $A_{s,t} = a'$ . When  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  is an  $a$ -box and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  is an  $a'$ -box,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the west or north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . On the other hand, when both  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  are  $a'$ -boxes,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ .*

(c) *Suppose that  $A_{i,j} = A_{s,t} = a'$ . Then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ .*

**Proof.** When  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  or  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  consists of a single box, the desired results are immediately from Lemma 3.13. Hence we will only deal with the case where both of them consist of at least two boxes.

(a) Identify  $(s, t)$  with  $o_2$  and  $(i, j)$  with  $o_1$ . Then the first assertion immediately follows from Lemma 3.13 together with [2, Lemma 2 (a)]. For the second assertion, we have to consider the following two cases.


If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and in  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  simultaneously,  $(A \cup B)_{s,t}$  and  $(A \cup B)_{i,j}$  are on the main diagonal and on the next column of  $(A \cup B)_{s,t}$ , respectively. It says that  $i = t = s$  and  $j = s+1$ . By the given assumption, either (S4) or (S7) is applied to  $\sigma^k(A \cup B)$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , thus  $\{(s, s+1), (s+1, s+1)\}$  and  $\{(s, s), (s, s+1)\}$  should be contained in  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$ , respectively. Therefore, by Lemma 3.13,  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  is to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . See the following figure:




If either (S4) or (S7) occurs only in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$ ,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  do not intersect since neither (S4) nor (S7) occurs in  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.13,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is given by  $\{(s,t), (s+1,t), \dots, (t,t)\}$ . It follows that  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the west of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ .

(b) In the first case, neither (S4) nor (S7) does not occur in the shifted switching processes corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$ . It can be easily verified that the assertion can be deduced from Lemma 3.13 together with [2, Lemma 2] by identifying  $(s,t)$  with  $o_2'$  and  $(i,j)$  with  $o_1$ .

For the second case, we need to consider the following two subcases. If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  simultaneously, we obtain the desired result in the same way as in (a). If either (S4) or (S7) occurs only in the shifted switching processes corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$ , then  $(A \cup B)_{i,j}$  is on the main diagonal and  $(A \cup B)_{s,t}$  is to the northeast of  $(A \cup B)_{i,j}$ . So  $j = i$  and  $s < i$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.13,  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  is given by  $\{(i,i), (i,i+1), \dots, (i,i+r)\}$  for some  $r \geq 1$ . It follows that  $(A \cup B)_{i,i+r}$  is filled with  $b$ . Furthermore,  $t$  should be greater than or equal to  $i+r-1$ . Otherwise  $(A \cup B)_{s,i+r-1}$  and  $(A \cup B)_{s,i+r}$  are filled with  $b'$ , which is a contradiction. If  $t = i+r-1$ , then  $(A \cup B)_{s,i+r}$  is filled with  $b'$ . So  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  contains  $\{(s,t), (s,t+1)\}$ . It means that  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . Refer to the following figure:



If  $t > i+r-1$ , then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is also to the north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$  since the  $i$ th row contains  $\mathbf{b}$ -boxes from  $(i,i+2)$  to  $(i,i+r)$ . Refer to the following figure:



(c) Identify  $(s,t)$  with  $o_2$  and  $(i,j)$  with  $o_1$ . Then this case immediately follows from Lemma 3.13 together with [2, Lemma 2 (a)].  $\square$

Now we are ready to present the proof of Proposition 3.3.

**Proof of Proposition 3.3.** The only nontrivial part of the proof is to see that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  and  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(b)}$  are shifted perforated tableaux for all  $m = 1, \dots, n$ . For a fixed inner corner of  $B$  let us move this box until it becomes a removable corner by applying a sequence of shifted slides. In each step one can see that the corresponding filling satisfies the four conditions in Definition 3.1. Therefore the final filling obtained by discarding the new removable corner in the above is an SYT

of border strip shape. By repeating this process, one can see that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(b)}$  is a shifted perforated **b**-tableau.

Next we will show that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  is a shifted perforated **a**-tableau. Set  $\square(A \cup B) = (s, t)$  and let  $k_1$  be the smallest positive integer such that the  $(s, t)$  box is moved to a removable corner, which is nothing but  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$ , after applying  $\sigma^{k_1}$ . As the first step, we will show that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  is a shifted perforated tableau for all  $m = 1, \dots, k_1$ . When  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is horizontal or vertical, the perforateness is obviously being preserved in the corresponding switching process. When  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)} = \{(s, t), (s, t+1), (s+1, t+1)\}$ , if  $\square(A \cup B)$  is filled with  $a$  (resp.,  $a'$ ), then the perforateness is being preserved since  $\square(A \cup B)$  is the easternmost  $a$ -box (resp., the southernmost  $a'$ -box) in  $A \cup B$ .

For  $1 \leq l \leq |A|$ , let  $A_l$  denote the boxes in  $A$  occupied by  $l$  in  $\text{stan}^*(A)$ . Let  $k_l$  denote the nonnegative integer such that  $A_l$  is moved to a removable corner after applying  $\sigma^{k_1+\dots+k_l}$  to  $A \cup B$ . Hereafter we abbreviate  $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_l$  to  $\epsilon(l)$ . If  $|A| = 1$ ,  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  is a shifted perforated **a**-tableau for all  $m = 1, \dots, \epsilon(1)$  by the above paragraph. Now assume that  $|A| > 1$ . For  $1 \leq l \leq |A| - 1$ , we will show that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  is a shifted perforated **a**-tableau for all  $m = \epsilon(l) + 1, \dots, \epsilon(l) + k_{l+1}$  under the assumption that  $\sigma^m(A \cup B)^{(a)}$  is a shifted perforated **a**-tableau for all  $m = 1, \dots, \epsilon(l)$ . Let  $A_l$  be positioned at  $(i, j)$  and  $A_{l+1}$  at  $(s, t)$ .

First, assume that both  $A_{s,t}$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  are  $a$ -boxes. Then  $A_{i,j} = a$  and therefore, by Lemma 3.14,  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the west of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . Second, assume that  $A_{s,t}$  is an  $a$ -box and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  is an  $a'$ -box. If either (S4) or (S7) occurs only in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$ , then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is vertical and so the perforateness is being preserved. If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching processes corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  simultaneously, then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is horizontal and thus  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the strictly north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . Finally, assume that both  $A_{s,t}$  and  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(s,t)})$  are  $a'$ -boxes. If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching processes corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  and  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  simultaneously, then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is horizontal and thus  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the strictly north of  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . If neither (S4) nor (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$ , then  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the strictly north of the  $a'$ -box  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ , or  $\vec{P}_{(s,t)}$  is to the strictly north or west of the  $a$ -box  $\text{End}(\vec{P}_{(i,j)})$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. PROPERTIES AND APPLICATIONS OF THE SHIFTED TABLEAU SWITCHING

The primary purpose of this section is show that our shifted tableau switching is involutive and behave very nicely with respect to tableaux whose reading words satisfy the lattice property. To do this let us review (skew) Schur  $P$ - and  $Q$ -functions very briefly.

For  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\mu \subset \lambda$ , let us define (skew) Schur  $P$ - and  $Q$ -functions by

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(x) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{Y}(\lambda/\mu)} x^T \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{\lambda/\mu}(x) = \sum_{T \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda/\mu)} x^T.$$

When  $\mu = \emptyset$ , we simply write them as  $P_\lambda(x)$  and  $Q_\lambda(x)$ . It is well known that  $P_\lambda(x)$  and  $Q_\lambda(x)$  indexed by  $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$  form a basis of the subring they generate in the ring of symmetric functions, respectively. See [10] for more details. For  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda^+$ , *shifted Littlewood-Richardson (LR) coefficients*  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  are the structure constants appearing in the expansion of the product of two  $P_\lambda$  and  $P_\mu$ , that is,

$$P_\lambda(x) \cdot P_\mu(x) = \sum_{\nu} f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu P_\nu(x).$$

To prove the positivity of  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  in a combinatorial way has been an important and interesting problem in the study of combinatorics of symmetric functions. For instance, [12, 17, 19] approach to this problem with SYTs and very recently [3, 4, 6, 9, 15] with another combinatorial objects called ‘semistandard decomposition tableaux’. We here focus on the former approach.

It is due to Sagan and Worley that  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  counts the standard shifted Young tableaux  $S$  of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  with  $\text{Rect}(S) = T$  for an arbitrarily chosen standard shifted Young tableau  $T$  of shape  $\mu$ . Moreover, they proved that  $\text{Rect}(S)$  depends not on the shape of  $S$  but on its reading word  $w(S)$ . Later, Stembridge [17] gave a characterization for the SYTs that rectify to the special SYT, denoted by  $R_\mu$ , whose  $i$ th row consists of only  $i$ ’s for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell(\mu)$ . By virtue of their seminal works one can interpret the identity

$$Q_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_{\mu} f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu Q_\mu(x) \quad (1)$$

in a combinatorial way by using the shifted jeu de taquin. We here give another combinatorial interpretation of (1) by using our shifted tableau switching. To do this, we need to review Stembridge’s combinatorial interpretation of  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$ . Let us first introduce necessary definitions and notation.

Given any word  $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$  in  $X$ , let  $\hat{w}$  be the word obtained from  $w$  by reading  $w$  from right to left, and then replacing each  $k$  by  $(k+1)'$  and each  $k'$  by  $k$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $|w|$  denote the word obtained by erasing the primes of  $w$ . For example, if  $w = 11'2'12'2$ , then  $\hat{w} = 3'22'212'$  and  $|w| = 112122$ .

Let  $w\hat{w} = a_1 \cdots a_{2n}$  be the concatenation of  $w$  and  $\hat{w}$ , and then define a sequence of statistics  $m_i(j)$  ( $0 \leq j \leq 2n, i \geq 1$ ) depending on  $w$  by the multiplicity of  $i$  among  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_j$  when  $1 \leq j \leq 2n$ , or 0 when  $j = 0$ . The word  $w$  is said to satisfy the *lattice property* if, whenever  $m_i(j) = m_{i-1}(j)$ , we have that  $a_{j+1}$  is neither  $i$  nor  $i'$ . Let us call a word satisfying the lattice property a *lattice word*.

**Theorem 4.1.** ([17, Theorem 8.3]) *The shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficient  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  is the number of SYTs  $T$  of shape  $\text{sh}(T) = \nu/\lambda$  and  $\text{wt}(T) = \mu$  such that*

- (a)  $w = w(T)$  satisfies the lattice property, and
- (b) the rightmost  $i$  of  $|w|$  is unprimed in  $w$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\mu)$ ).

Notice that each SYT satisfying the condition (b) in Theorem 4.1 belongs to  $\mathcal{Y}(\nu/\lambda)$ . Let  $\mathcal{Y}(\nu/\lambda, \mu) := \{T \in \mathcal{Y}(\nu/\lambda) : \text{wt}(T) = \mu\}$  and let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu := \{T \in \mathcal{Y}(\nu/\lambda, \mu) : w(T) \text{ satisfies (a) and (b) in Theorem 4.1}\}.$$

We call an SYT  $T$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  a *Littlewood-Richardson-Stembridge (LRS) tableau* and a word satisfying both the lattice property and Theorem 4.1(b) an *LRS word*.

$$\square(\sigma^{v_s}({}^AB, A_B)) = (i, j + y - s).$$

Then we have

$$\sigma^{v_1+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{v_1}(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j), \dots, (i, j+y-1).$$

More generally, for  $1 \leq s \leq y$  and  $v_s \leq r \leq v_{s+1} - 1$ , it is not difficult to see that

$$\sigma^{r+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{r+1-s}(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j), \dots, (i, j+y-s).$$

It should be noticed that we are regarding  $v_{y+1}$  as a sufficiently large integer. This implies that  $(\Sigma(^AB, A_B))_{i,j} = A^{[k+1]}$  and

$$\Sigma(^AB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j)$$

because the  $(i, j)$  box is not in  $\Sigma(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B)$ .

In case of **T2**,  $\sigma^{u+x}(A, B)$  is fully switched. For  $1 \leq s \leq x$ , let  $v_s$  be the integer uniquely determined by the condition

$$\square(\sigma^{v_s}(^AB, A_B)) = (i+x-s, j).$$

For  $1 \leq s \leq x$  and  $v_s \leq r \leq v_{s+1} - 1$ ,

$$\sigma^{r+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{r+1-s}(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j), \dots, (i+x-s, j).$$

Here we are regarding  $v_{x+1}$  as a sufficiently large integer. This equivalence holds since  $\square(\sigma^{v_1}(^AB, A_B)) = (i+x-1, j)$  is switched with an **a**-box placed at  $(i+x, j)$  regardless of the  $(i+x, j-1)$  box. As in case of **T1**, it holds that  $(\Sigma(^AB, A_B))_{i,j} = A^{[k+1]}$  and

$$\Sigma(^AB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j).$$

Finally, in case of **T3**,  $\sigma^u(A, B)$  must contain one of the following subfillings:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline & b' \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline & b \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline b' & b \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \mathbf{a} & b' \\ \hline b & b \\ \hline \end{array}$$

It implies that  $(^AB, A_B)$  must contain one of the following subfillings:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b & b \\ \hline & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & b \\ \hline b' & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & b \\ \hline b & \mathbf{a} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Note that in the first two subfillings, the upper leftmost box denotes the  $(i, i)$  box in  $\sigma^u(A, B)$  and  $(^AB, A_B)$ , respectively. In particular,  $A^{[k+1]} = A_{i,i}$ . Let  $v$  be the integer uniquely determined by the condition

$$\square(\sigma^v(^AB, A_B)) = (i, i+1).$$

Applying (S4) to  $\square(\sigma^v(^AB, A_B))$ , we can deduce that

$$\sigma^{v+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^v(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

Furthermore, since the  $(i, i)$  **a**-box in  $\sigma^{v+1}(^AB, A_B)$  cannot be switched with any **b**-box in  $\sigma^{v+1}(^AB, A_B)$ , it follows that for  $r \geq 1$ ,

$$\sigma^{v+1+r}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{v+r}(^{A^{[k]}}B, A^{[k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

For the remaining two subfillings, we let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be the integer uniquely determined by

$$\square(\sigma^{v_1}(^AB, A_B)) = (i, j+1)$$

and

$$\square(\sigma^{v_2}(^AB, A_B)) = (i, j),$$

respectively. Here the  $(i, j)$  box is the upper leftmost box in the each subfilling. Then

$$\sigma^{v_1+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{v_1}(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j) \text{ and } (i, j+1).$$

Now consider any **b**-box on the southwest of  $(i, j)$ . The shifted switching path of the  $(i, j)$  box does not contain  $(i, j+1)$ . Moreover, the  $(i, j)$  **a**-box in  $\sigma^{v_2+1}(^AB, A_B)$  cannot be switched with any **b**-box in  $\sigma^{v_2+1}(^AB, A_B)$ . Therefore, for  $s = 1, 2$  and  $v_s \leq r \leq v_{s+1} - 1$ ,

$$\sigma^{r+1}(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{r+1-s}(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j) \text{ and } (i, j+2-s).$$

Here we are regarding  $v_3$  as a sufficiently large integer. Hence we showed for all subfillings above that

$$\Sigma(^AB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j),$$


where  $A^{[k+1]} = A_{i,j}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $|A| = k+1$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) and  $B$  extends  $A$ . Let  $A^{[k+1]} = A_{i,i}$ . If either (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process corresponding to  $\vec{P}_{(i,i)}$ , then*

$$\Sigma(^AB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

**Proof.** Let  $u$  be the smallest integer such that  $\sigma^u(A^{[\leq k]}, B)$  is fully switched. Then the  $u$ th switch should be (S4) or (S7) and by which  $A^{[k+1]}$  is moved from  $(i, i)$  to  $(i, i+1)$ .

When (S4) is applied to  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$ , the  $(i, i+1)$  box in  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$  is filled with  $a$  and this box is in the shifted switching path of  $A^{[k]}$ . In particular, the  $(i, i+2)$  box in  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$  is either an  $a$ -box or an empty box and the  $i$ th column in  $A \cup B$  has only a single box at  $(i, i)$ . Refer to the following figure:



Hence  $\sigma^u(A, B)$  is fully switched and

$$(^AB, A_B) \approx (^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i), (i, i+1) \text{ and } (i+1, i+1).$$

Let  $v$  be the integer such that  $\square(\sigma^v(^AB, A_B)) = (i, i)$ . We see that  $\square(\sigma^v(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B)) = (i, i+1)$  and for  $0 \leq r \leq v$ ,

$$\sigma^r(^AB, A_B) \approx \sigma^r(^{A^{[\leq k]}}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i), (i, i+1) \text{ and } (i+1, i+1).$$


Since (S2) and (S3) are applied to  $\square(\sigma^v(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B))$  and  $\square(\sigma^v(A^vB, A_B))$ , respectively, it follows that

$$\sigma^{v+1}(A^vB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{v+1}(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

This implies that whenever  $r \geq v+1$ , the switch to be applied to  $\sigma^r(A^vB, A_B)$  should be same to that to be applied to  $\sigma^r(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B)$ . Thus we see that

$$\Sigma(A^vB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

When (S7) is applied to  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$ , then  $\square(\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)) = (i, i+1)$ . Moreover,  $(i+1, i+1)$  and  $(i, i+2)$  in  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$  respectively are filled with **b** and  $b$ . We claim that  $A^{[k]} = A_{i, i+1}$ . Suppose that  $A^{[k]} \neq A_{i, i+1}$ . Then  $(i-1, i+1)$  is in the shifted switching path of  $A^{[k]}$  and filled with  $a$  in  $\sigma^{u-2}(A, B)$ . Now let us investigate the  $(i-1, i+2)$  box in  $\sigma^{u-2}(A, B)$ . If it is filled with  $a$ , then  $\square(\sigma^{u-2}(A, B)) = (i-1, i+2)$  and thus  $\square(\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)) = (i-1, i+1)$  or  $(i-1, i+3)$ . If it is filled with  $b'$ , then the  $(u-1)$ st switch is (S1) and  $\square(\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)) = (i-1, i+2)$ . This shows that the  $(i-1, i+2)$  box should be filled with  $b$  in  $\sigma^{u-2}(A, B)$ , thus in  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$ . It is obviously a contradiction to the fact that the  $(i, i+2)$  box in  $\sigma^{u-1}(A, B)$  is filled with  $b$ . Hence we verified the claim. In addition, by using this property, we see that the  $i$ th column in  $A \cup B$  has only a single box at  $(i, i)$ . Refer to the following figure:



Suppose that  $\vec{P}_{(i,i)} = \{(i, i), \dots, (i, i+y)\}$  for some  $y \geq 2$ . Then  $\sigma^{u+y-1}(A, B)$  is fully switched and

$$(A^vB, A_B) \approx (A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i), \dots, (i, i+y) \text{ and } (i+1, i+1).$$

For  $1 \leq s \leq y$ , let  $v_s$  be the integer determined by the condition

$$\square(\sigma^{v_s}(A^vB, A_B)) = (i, i+y-s).$$

Then, for  $1 \leq s \leq y-1$  and  $v_s \leq r \leq v_{s+1}-1$ ,

$$\sigma^{r+1}(A^vB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{r+1-s}(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i), \dots, (i, i+y-s) \text{ and } (i+1, i+1).$$

Applying  $\sigma$  to the case where  $s = y-1$  and  $r = v_y-1$ , one can see that

$$\sigma^{v_y+1}(A^vB, A_B) \approx \sigma^{v_y-y+2}(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

This equivalence implies that for each  $r \geq 1$ , the switch to be applied to  $\sigma^{v_y+r}(A^vB, A_B)$  is equal to that to be applied to  $\sigma^{v_y-y+r+1}(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B)$ . Thus we see that

$$\Sigma(A^vB, A_B) \approx \Sigma(A^{[\leq k]}B, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, i).$$

□


**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Then  $\Sigma(A, B) = (A, B)$ .*

**Proof.** We prove the assertion by induction on the number of boxes in  $A$ . To begin with, consider the case where  $A$  consists of a single box. Let  $(i, j)$  be its position. As in the proof of Lemma 4.4, the type of  $\vec{P}_{(i,j)}$  is one of **T1**, **T2** and **T3**. Let  $u$  be the smallest integer such that  $\sigma^u(A, B)$  is fully switched.

In case of **T1**, when the  $(i+1, j)$  box is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$  in  $B$ , the  $(i, j+1)$  box is filled with  $b'$  and all boxes  $(i, j+2)$  through  $(i, j+y)$  should be filled with  $b$ . On the other hand, when the  $(i+1, j)$  box is not in  $B$ , the  $(i, j+1)$  box is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$  and all boxes  $(i, j+2)$  through  $(i, j+y)$  should be filled with  $b$ . In either case, since the  $(i-1, j+y)$  box is a  $b'$ -box or an empty box, it follows that  $\sigma^i(A, B) = \sigma^{u-i}(A, B)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq u$ . Thus  $\sigma^u(A, B) = (A, B)$ .

In case of **T2**, all boxes  $(i+1, j)$  through  $(i+x-1, j)$  are filled with  $b'$ , whereas the  $(i+x, j)$  box is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$ . When the  $(i+x, j-1)$  box is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$  in  $B$ , the  $(i+x, j)$  box is filled with  $b$ . On the other hand, when the  $(i+x, j-1)$  box is not in  $B$ , it is filled with  $\mathbf{b}$ . In either case, since  $\square(A, B) = (i+x-1, j)$ , it follows that  $\sigma^i(A, B) = \sigma^{u-i}(A, B)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq u$ . Thus  $\sigma^u(A, B) = (A, B)$ .

Finally, one can easily see that the **T3** case can occur only in the following sub-fillings:



For all subfillings above, it is straightforward to see that  $\Sigma(A, B) = (A, B)$ .

We now assume that the desired result holds for all SYTs of border strip shape with  $k$  boxes. Suppose that  $A$  has  $k+1$  boxes. Letting  $A^{[k+1]} = A_{i,j}$ , by Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\Sigma(A, B) \approx \Sigma(A^{[\leq k]}, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \quad \text{up to } (i, j).$$

Moreover, from induction hypothesis it follows that

$$\Sigma(A^{[\leq k]}, A^{[\leq k]}_B) = (A^{[\leq k]}, B).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(A, B) &= A^{[k+1]} \cup \Sigma(A^{[\leq k]}, A^{[\leq k]}_B) \\ &= A^{[k+1]} \cup (A^{[\leq k]}, B) \\ &= (A, B), \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.7.** ([2, Lemma 1]) *Let two words  $u$  and  $v$  be shifted Knuth equivalent. Then  $u$  is an LRS word if and only if  $v$  is an LRS word.*

Now we are ready to provide the proof of Theorem 4.3.

**Proof of Theorem 4.3.** (a) Lemma 4.6 says that  $\Sigma \circ \Sigma(A \cup B) = A \cup B$  for any perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . So the assertion follows from Remark 3.11(ii).

(b) Let  $T$  be an LRS tableau and  $T'$  any filling obtained by a sequence of shifted slides to  $T$ . By applying Lemma 4.7 in iteration, we can deduce that  $T$  is an LRS tableau if and only if  $w(T')$  is an LRS word. In particular, by Remark 3.2(i),  $w({}^S T)$  is an LRS word. Consequently  ${}^S T$  is an LRS tableau.

(c) Let  $S$  be an LRS tableau. By (b),  $S_T$  is an LRS tableau if and only if  ${}^{S_T} S_T$  is an LRS tableau. Now our assertion is straightforward since  ${}^{S_T} S_T = S$  by (a).  $\square$

**Example 4.8.** Let  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\lambda, \mu \subseteq \nu$ .

(a) (The shifted Littlewood-Richardson rule) By Theorem 4.3 we obtain a bijection

$$\Sigma : \mathcal{F}_{\emptyset\lambda}^\lambda \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda) \rightarrow \bigcup_{\mu \subseteq \nu} \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu) \times \mathcal{F}_{\mu\lambda}^\nu, \quad (R_\lambda, T) \mapsto ({}^{R_\lambda} T, (R_\lambda)_T).$$

This immediately gives a combinatorial interpretation of  $Q_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_\mu f_{\mu\lambda}^\nu Q_\mu(x)$ .

(b) (Symmetry of the shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficients) By Theorem 4.3 we obtain a bijection

$$\Sigma : \mathcal{F}_{\emptyset\lambda}^\lambda \times \mathcal{F}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\emptyset\mu}^\mu \times \mathcal{F}_{\mu\lambda}^\nu, \quad (R_\lambda, T) \mapsto (R_\mu, (R_\lambda)_T).$$

Hence, not only have we proven  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = f_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$ , we have constructed an explicit involution that interchanges the inner shape with the weight of an LRS tableau.

## 5. WORLEY'S SHIFTED $J$ -OPERATION AND THE SHIFTED GENERALIZED EVACUATION

Worley [19] introduced a shifted analogue of Schützenberger's  $J$ -operation [14] in order to explain the identities related with shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficients in a combinatorial way. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the relationship between Worley's shifted  $J$ -operation and our shifted tableau switching.

Let  $-X$  be the set  $\{\cdots < -2' < -2 < -1' < -1\}$  of ordered alphabets and  $\overline{X}$  be the set  $\{\cdots < -1' < -1 < 0' < 0 < 1' < 1 < \cdots\}$ . Throughout this section, we use the following notation:

- $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_-(\lambda/\mu)$ : the set of all SYTs of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  with letters in  $-X$
- $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_+(\lambda/\mu)$ : the set of all SYTs of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  with letters in  $\overline{X}$

It should be particularly noticed that, in the present section, an SYT always denotes an element in  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\lambda/\mu)$ . Recall that  $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\lambda/\mu)$  is of normal shape if  $\mu = \emptyset$ . For an unprimed letter  $a \in \overline{X}$ , set  $a^* := -a'$  and  $(a')^* := -a$ . Conventionally,  $-(-\mathbf{a})$  is set to be  $\mathbf{a}$ .

**Definition 5.1.** ([19]) Given  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\mu \subset \lambda$ , let  $T$  be an SYT of skew shape  $\lambda/\mu$ . Then  $T^*$  is defined by the SYT obtained by transporting each box  $(i, j)$  in  $T$  to  $(\lambda_1 - j + 1, \lambda_1 - i + 1)$  and then by filling it with  $(T_{i,j})^*$ . Equivalently,  $\text{sh}(T^*) = \{(\lambda_1 - j + 1, \lambda_1 - i + 1) : (i, j) \in \text{sh}(T)\}$  and  $(T^*)_{\lambda_1 - j + 1, \lambda_1 - i + 1} = (T_{i,j})^*$ .

Given  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\mu \subset \lambda$ , let us consider the map

$$J : \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\lambda/\mu) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\nu \in \Lambda^+} \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\nu), \quad T \mapsto \text{Rect}(T^*).$$

For simplicity, we write  $T^J$  for  $J(T)$ . Then the following result is well known.

**Lemma 5.2.** ([19, Lemma 7.1.4]) *Let  $T$  be an SYT. Then we have the following.*

- (a) If  $T$  is of normal shape, then  $\text{sh}(T^J) = \text{sh}(T)$  and  $(T^J)^J = T$ .  
 (b) If  $T$  is of skew shape, then  $w(\text{Rect}(T^*)) \equiv_{\text{SK}} w(\text{Rect}(T)^*)$ , that is,  $T^J = (\text{Rect}(T))^J$ .

For instance, if

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1' & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline & 2 & 3' & \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array},$$

then one can easily see that

$$T^* = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & -2' \\ \hline & -3' & -3 & -1' \\ \hline & & -2' & -1' \\ \hline & & & -1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T^J = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline -3' & -3 & -2' & -1 \\ \hline & -2' & -1' & \\ \hline & & -1 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

In Example 4.8(b) we showed  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = f_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$  by using the shifted tableau switching. Worley had, however, obtained this result much earlier by using the shifted  $J$ -operation. His argument can be restated in the following manner.

**Theorem 5.3.** ([19, Theorem 7.2.2]) *For each  $T \in \mathcal{F}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  define  $\rho(T)$  to be the SYT uniquely determined by the condition that  $((R_\lambda)^J \cup T)^J = (R_\mu)^J \cup \rho(T)$ . Then the function*

$$\rho : \mathcal{F}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mu\lambda}^\nu, \quad T \mapsto \rho(T)$$

*is a bijection.*

Hence it would be very natural to search for the relationship between Worley's shifted  $J$ -operation and our shifted tableau switching. For this purpose, we first provide a shifted analogue of [1, Algorithm 5.2], which is called the *generalized evacuation* there.

**Algorithm 5.4.** (The shifted generalized evacuation) Let  $S$  be an SYT of normal shape.

**Step 1:** Start with  $S$  whose boxes are all unshaded. Set  $S^E := \emptyset$  and  $m := \max(S)$ .

**Step 2:** Set  $a := \min(S)$ .

**Step 3:** Do one of the following on  $S^{(a)}$ , where  $S = S^{(a)} \cup S^{(a+1)} \cup \dots \cup S^{(m)}$ .


- If  $S_{1,1} = a$ , then replace it with  $-a'$  and the entries in  $S^{(a)}$  except  $S_{1,1}$  with  $-a'$ 's.
- If  $S_{1,1} = a'$ , then replace it with  $-a$  and the entries in  $S^{(a)}$  except  $S_{1,1}$  with  $-a'$ 's.

Set  $S^{(a)}$  newly to be the resulting SYT of border strip shape. Then shade all the boxes in  $S^{(a)}$ .

**Step 4:** If  $a = m$ , then put  $S^E := S^{(a)} \cup S^E$  and finish the algorithm. If  $a \neq m$ , then apply Algorithm 3.8 to  $(S^{(a)}, S^{(a+1)} \cup \dots \cup S^{(m)})$  and then go to **Step 5**.

**Step 5:** Set  $S := S^{(a)}(S^{(a+1)} \cup \dots \cup S^{(m)})$  and  $S^E := (S^{(a)})_{S^{(a+1)} \cup \dots \cup S^{(m)}} \cup S^E$ . Then go to **Step 2**.

From Theorem 3.9 it follows that  $S^E$  is an SYT. As an illustration, for the SYT  $T$  following Lemma 5.2,  $T^E$  can be obtained as follows:



Suppose that  $A$  is an SYT consisting of  $m$   $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes. Define  $A^{\text{st}}$  by the SYT obtained from  $A$  by replacing all  $a$ 's by  $1', 2', \dots, k'$  from top to bottom, and next all  $a$ 's by  $k+1, k+2, \dots, m$  from left to right, where  $k$  is the number of  $a$ 's. And define  $A^{\widehat{\text{st}}}$  as follows:

- If the southwesternmost box of  $A$  is filled with  $a'$ , then replace all  $a$ 's by  $-1', -2', \dots, -i'$  from right to left, and next all  $a$ 's by  $-(i+1)', \dots, -m'$  from bottom to top.
- If the southwesternmost box of  $A$  is filled with  $a$ , then replace all  $a$ 's by  $-1, -2', \dots, -i'$  from right to left, and next all  $a$ 's by  $-(i+1)', \dots, -m'$  from bottom to top.

Note that if  $A^{\widehat{\text{st}}} = B^{\widehat{\text{st}}}$ , then  $A = B$  since the process obtaining  $A^{\widehat{\text{st}}}$  from  $A$  is reversible. The following theorem shows the relationship between the shifted  $J$ -operation and the shifted generalized evacuation for SYTs of normal shape.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $S$  be an SYT of normal shape. Then  $S^E = S^J$ .*

**Proof.** We prove the assertion by induction on the number of boxes in  $S$ . In case where  $S$  consists of a single  $\mathbf{a}$ -box, it is clear that  $S^E = S^J = \boxed{\mathbf{a}^*}$ . Now assume that the assertion holds for all SYTs of normal shape with  $\leq n$  boxes. Suppose that  $S$  is an SYT of normal shape with  $n+1$  boxes and set  $a := \min(S)$ . Let  $T$  be the SYT obtained by deleting  $S^{(a)}$  from  $S$ .

**Case 1:**  $|(S^{(a)})| = 1$

Let us obtain  $(\text{Rect}(T), (S^{(a)})^E)_T$  by applying the shifted switching process to  $(S^{(a)})^E, T$ . Then, applying Algorithm 5.4 to  $\text{Rect}(T)$ , we see that  $S^E = \text{Rect}(T)^E \cup (S^{(a)})^E_T$ . Notice that  $(S^{(a)})^E_T$  is an  $\mathbf{a}^*$ -box since  $S^{(a)}$  is a single  $\mathbf{a}^*$ -box. On the other hand,  $S^J = \text{Rect}(T^*) \cup Y$ , where  $Y$  consists of a single  $\mathbf{a}^*$ -box. Since  $\text{Rect}(T)$  is an SYT of normal shape and  $\text{Rect}(T^*) = \text{Rect}(T)^J$  by Lemma 5.2, it follows that  $\text{Rect}(T^*) = \text{Rect}(T)^E$  by induction hypothesis. Also,  $(S^{(a)})^E_T$  and  $Y$  have the same letter and have the same position since  $\text{sh}(S^E) = \text{sh}(S^J) = \text{sh}(S)$ , hence  $(S^{(a)})^E_T = Y$ .

**Case 2:**  $m := |(S^{(a)})| \geq 2$

By shifting all the entries of  $S$  if necessary, we may assume that  $\text{wt}_{\min(S)}(S) \leq \min(S)$ . As in **Case 1**, we see that  $S^E = \text{Rect}(T)^E \cup (S^{(a)})^E_T$  and  $S^J = \text{Rect}(T)^J \cup$

$Y$ , where  $Y$  consists of all  $\mathbf{a}^*$ -boxes in  $S^J$ . From induction hypothesis it follows that  $\text{Rect}(T)^E = \text{Rect}(T)^J$ . Hence for the proof it suffices to show that  $(S^{(a)E})_T = Y$ .

First, we claim that  $((S^{(a)\text{st}})^E)_T = \hat{Y}$ , where  $\hat{Y}$  is the SYT obtained by removing  $\text{Rect}(T)^J$  from  $(S^{(a)\text{st}} \cup T)^J$ . When we replace  $S^{(a)}$  by  $S^{(a)\text{st}}$  in  $S$ ,  $S^{(a)\text{st}} \cup T$  is still an SYT by the assumption that  $\text{wt}_{\min(S)}(S) \leq \min(S)$  and therefore we can deduce from **Case 1** that

$$(S^{(a)\text{st}} \cup T)^E = (S^{(a)\text{st}} \cup T)^J. \quad (2)$$

On the other hand, by the definition of  $E$ ,

$$(S^{(a)\text{st}} \cup T)^E = \text{Rect}(T)^E \cup \left( (S^{(a)\text{st}})^E \right)_T.$$

Now the claim follows from (2) along with the definition of  $\hat{Y}$ .


Second, we claim that

$$\left( (S^{(a)E})_T \right)^{\hat{\text{st}}} = \left( (S^{(a)\text{st}})^E \right)_T. \quad (3)$$

Let us consider  $\Sigma(S^{(a)E}, T^{(a+1)})$  and  $\Sigma((S^{(a)\text{st}})^E, T^{(a+1)})$ . Since the (reverse) standardization of  $S^{(a)E}$  is equal to that of  $(S^{(a)\text{st}})^E$ , it follows from Remark 3.7(v) that

$$\text{stan} \left( (S^{(a)E})_{T^{(a+1)}} \right) = \text{stan} \left( \left( (S^{(a)\text{st}})^E \right)_{T^{(a+1)}} \right).$$

In case where neither (S4) nor (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process on  $(S^{(a)E}, T^{(a+1)})$  and in that of  $((S^{(a)\text{st}})^E, T^{(a+1)})$ , the  $(-1)$ -box in  $((S^{(a)\text{st}})^E)_{T^{(a+1)}}$  and the southwesternmost  $(-\mathbf{a})$ -box in  $(S^{(a)E})_{T^{(a+1)}}$  are both primed or both unprimed since the southwesternmost  $(-\mathbf{a})$ -box in  $S^{(a)E}$  is moved to the southwesternmost  $(-\mathbf{a})$ -box in  $(S^{(a)E})_{T^{(a+1)}}$  by Lemma 3.14. Even when (S4) or (S7) occurs in the shifted switching process on  $(S^{(a)E}, T^{(a+1)})$ , it is easy to see that they are both primed or both unprimed. See following figures:




It follows that

$$\left( (S^{(a)E})_{T^{(a+1)}} \right)^{\hat{\text{st}}} = \left( (S^{(a)\text{st}})^E \right)_{T^{(a+1)}}.$$

Since the shifted switching process on  $(S^{(a)E}, T)$  is performed inductively in the order  $T^{(a+1)}, T^{(a+2)}, \dots, T^{(\max(S))}$ , (3) can be obtained by applying the above method to  $a+1, a+2, \dots, \max(S)$ .

Finally, we claim that  $Y^{\hat{\text{st}}} = \hat{Y}$ . Notice that  $T^J \cup Y = \text{Rect}(T^* \cup S^{(a)*})$  and  $T^J \cup \hat{Y} = \text{Rect}(T^* \cup (S^{(a)\text{st}})^*)$ . Both  $S^{(a)*}$  and  $(S^{(a)\text{st}})^*$  extend  $T^*$  and they have

the same standardization as a vertical strip. Thus, when no special slides occur in the shifted sliding processes on  $S^{(a)*}$  in  $T^J \cup Y$  and  $(S^{(a)\text{st}})^*$  in  $T^J \cup \hat{Y}$ , then we can apply the same shifted sliding process to  $S^{(a)*}$  and to  $(S^{(a)\text{st}})^*$ . Here ‘the same shifted sliding process’ means that in each step we apply the same shifted slide to the same position. It implies that  $\text{stan}(Y) = \text{stan}(\hat{Y})$ . Furthermore, the  $(-1)$ -box in  $\hat{Y}$  and the southwesternmost  $(-\mathbf{a})$ -box in  $Y$  are both primed or both unprimed. Even when a special slide occurs in these processes, the same results are obtained. See the following figures:



Thus our claim is verified.

Combining the above three claims yields that

$$\left( (S^{(a)^E})_T \right)^{\hat{\text{st}}} = \left( (S^{(a)\text{st}})^E \right)_T = \hat{Y} = Y^{\hat{\text{st}}}.$$

Now the equality  $(S^{(a)^E})_T = Y$  follows from the reversibility of  $\hat{\text{st}}$ .  $\square$

For any  $\lambda \subset \nu$ , let us consider the map

$$\varphi_\lambda : \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_-(\lambda) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda), \quad (S, T) \mapsto (S^J, T).$$

Set  $\varphi := \cup_{\lambda \subset \nu} \varphi_\lambda$ . We are ready to state the main result in this section.

**Theorem 5.6.** *For  $\lambda, \nu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\lambda \subset \nu$ , let  $S \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda)$  and  $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda)$ . Then  $(S^J \cup T)^J = T^J \cup S_T$ , and the following diagram*


$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\lambda) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma} & \bigsqcup_{\mu \subset \nu} \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\mu) \\ \varphi_\lambda \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\ \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_-(\lambda) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\lambda) & \xrightarrow{J} & \bigsqcup_{\mu \subset \nu} \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_-(\mu) \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu/\mu) \end{array}$$

commutes, that is,  $J \circ \varphi_\lambda = \varphi \circ \Sigma$ .

**Proof.** Since  $S^J \cup T \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\nu)$ , it follows that  $(S^J \cup T)^J \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_\pm(\nu)$ . Suppose that  $(S^J \cup T)^J = \text{Rect}(T)^J \cup Y$ . Since  $S^J \cup T$  is an SYT of normal shape,  $(S^J \cup T)^J = (S^J \cup T)^E$  by Theorem 5.5. On the other hand,  $(S^J \cup T)^E = \text{Rect}(T)^E \cup ((S^J)^E)_T$  by Algorithm 5.4. In addition,  $(S^J)^E = (S^J)^J = S$  since  $J$  is an involution and  $S^J$  is of normal shape. This proves the first assertion. The second one is immediate from the first.  $\square$

## 6. THE MODIFIED SHIFTED TABLEAU SWITCHING

Throughout this section, we will consider only shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pairs with no primed letters on the main diagonal. Unfortunately the set of these pairs is not closed under the shifted tableau switching. In more detail, if a switch defined in Section 3 is applied to the following  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes



then the resulting pairs have a primed letter on the main diagonal. To avoid this phenomenon, we introduce three new switches labelled by (S1'), (S2') and (S6').

- (S1') is applied in case where an  $a$ -box on the main diagonal is horizontally adjacent to a unique  $b'$ -box as follows:

$$(S1') \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a & b' \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b & a' \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (S2') is applied in case where an  $a'$ -box is vertically adjacent to a unique  $b$ -box on the main diagonal as follows:

$$(S2') \quad \begin{array}{|c|} \hline a' \\ \hline b \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|} \hline b' \\ \hline a \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (S6') is applied in case where an  $a'$ -box is horizontally adjacent to a  $b$ -box and vertically adjacent to a  $b$ -box on the main diagonal as follows:

$$(S6') \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline a' & b \\ \hline b & \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline b' & b \\ \hline a & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For the clarity we call these the *modified switches*. The original (S1), (S2) and (S6) will be used only in the cases other than the above three ones. Using the switches (S1) through (S7) together with (S1'), (S2') and (S6'), let us define the *modified shifted (tableau) switching process* on shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pairs in the same way as the shifted switching process has been defined. It should be remarked that the modified shifted switching process in which no modified switches are used is identical to the shifted switching process.

Suppose that  $T$  is a filling of a double border strip shape with letters  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  and is not fully switched. Let  $\tilde{\sigma}(T)$  denote the resulting filling obtained from  $T$  by applying a modified switch.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ .*

- Modified switches in total can appear at most once in the modified shifted switching process on  $(A, B)$ .*
- Each  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair appearing in the modified shifted switching process on  $(A, B)$  is still a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair.*

**Proof.** (a) Suppose that  $\tilde{\sigma}$  is applied to  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  for some  $k \geq 0$ . Here  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  is a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair by Proposition 3.3.

When  $\tilde{\sigma} = (S1')$  is applied to the  $(i, i)$   $a$ -box in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$ , then  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))_{i,i} = b$  and  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))_{i,i+1} = a'$ . Moreover, the  $(i+1, i+1)$  box is not contained in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  since if it is filled with  $b$ , then the switch to be applied to  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  is not (S1') but (S3). Now suppose that another modified switch is applied to  $\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B)$  for some  $j \geq 0$ . Then  $\square(\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))$  is  $(i-1, i)$  and has the neighbor to the south. Since  $(\sigma^k(A \cup B))_{i,i+1} = b'$ , it follows that  $(\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))_{i-1,i+1} = b'$ . Therefore the switch to be applied to  $\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B)$  is not a modified switch but (S5), which is absurd.

When  $\tilde{\sigma} = (S2')$  or  $(S6')$  is applied to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$ , then  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))_{i,i} = a$ ,  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))_{i-1,i} = b'$ , and the  $(i-1, i-1)$  box is not contained in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  by Definition 3.1. By the occurrence of  $(S2')$  or  $(S6')$ , the  $(i, i+1)$  box in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  cannot be filled with  $\mathbf{b}$ , so the  $(i, i+1)$  box in  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  is an  $a$ -box or an empty box. This implies that the  $(i, i)$   $a$ -box in  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))$  is fully switched and is a unique box on the main diagonal in  $(\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B))$ . As a result, no modified switches can be applied to  $(\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k)(A, B)$  for all  $j \geq 0$ .

(b) If a modified switch is not used in the modified shifted switching process, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, by (a), each  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair appearing in the modified shifted switching process can be written as  $\sigma^j \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B)$  for some nonnegative integers  $j, k$ . Due to Proposition 3.3, we have only to see that there exists a pair of SYTs  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$  such that  $\hat{B}$  extends  $\hat{A}$  and

$$\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B) = \sigma^{k+1}(\hat{A}, \hat{B}).$$

Set  $(A', B') := \sigma^k(A, B)$ .

First, suppose that  $\tilde{\sigma} = (S1')$  is applied to the  $(i, i)$   $a$ -box in  $A'$ . Then

$$\tilde{\sigma}(A', B') \approx \sigma(A', B') \quad \text{up to } (i, i) \text{ and } (i, i+1),$$

where  $\sigma = (S1)$ . Let  $B''$  be the filling obtained from  $B'$  by changing  $b'$  into  $b$  at  $(i, i+1)$ . It is a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{b}$ -tableau since the  $(i+1, i+1)$  box is not contained in  $B'$ . Similarly, let  $A''$  be the filling obtained from  $A'$  by changing  $a$  into  $a'$  at  $(i, i)$ . It is also a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{a}$ -tableau with a primed letter on the main diagonal since the  $(i, i)$   $a$ -box is the westernmost box in  $A'$ . Moreover, since the  $(i, i)$   $a'$ -box is the southwesternmost box in  $A''$ , it follows that  $\square(A'' \cup B'') = (i, i)$  and thus

$$\tilde{\sigma}(A', B') = \sigma(A'', B'').$$

Now define  $(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$  to be the pair of SYTs obtained from  $(A, B)$  by changing  $a$  into  $a'$  at the westernmost  $a$ -box in  $A$  and by changing  $b'$  into  $b$  at the southernmost  $b'$ -box in  $B$ . We claim that  $A'' \cup B'' = \sigma^k(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$ . Since the westernmost  $(i, i)$   $a$ -box in  $A$  is not affected by  $\sigma^k$  and the southernmost  $b'$ -box of  $B$  has been moved to the  $(i, i+1)$   $b'$ -box in  $B'$  through  $\sigma^k$ ,

$$\sigma^k(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) \approx A' \cup B' (\approx A'' \cup B'') \quad \text{up to } (i, i) \text{ and } (i, i+1).$$

The claim follows from the fact that the  $(i, i)$  box and  $(i, i+1)$  in  $\sigma^k(\hat{A}, \hat{B})$  are  $a'$  and  $b$ , respectively.

Second, suppose that  $\tilde{\sigma} = (S2')$  is applied to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box in  $A'$ . Then

$$\tilde{\sigma}(A', B') \approx \sigma(A', B') \quad \text{up to } (i-1, i) \text{ and } (i, i),$$

where  $\sigma = (S2)$ . Let  $A''$  be the filling obtained from  $A'$  by changing  $a'$  into  $a$  at  $(i-1, i)$ . It is a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{a}$ -tableau since no  $a'$ -boxes are in the  $i$ th row in  $A'$ . Similarly, let  $B''$  be the filling obtained from  $B'$  by changing  $b$  into  $b'$  at  $(i, i)$ . It is also a shifted perforated  $\mathbf{b}$ -tableau with a primed letter on the main diagonal since the  $(i, i)$   $b$ -box is the westernmost box in  $B'$ . In addition, since the  $(i-1, i)$  box in  $A'$  is the southernmost  $a'$ -box and the  $(i-1, i)$  box in  $A''$  is the westernmost  $a$ -box, it follows that  $\square(A' \cup B') = \square(A'' \cup B'') = (i-1, i)$ , and thus

$$\tilde{\sigma}(A', B') = \sigma(A'', B'').$$

Define  $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B})$  to be the pair of SYTs obtained from  $(A, B)$  by changing  $a'$  into  $a$  at the southernmost  $a'$ -box in  $A$  and  $b$  into  $b'$  at the westernmost  $b$ -box in  $B$ . We claim that  $A'' \cup B'' = \sigma^k(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B})$ . Notice that the  $(i, i+1)$  box is clearly not in  $A \cup B$ , so the  $(i, i)$  box is filled with  $b$  in  $A \cup B$ . Since  $(S2')$  is applied to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box, the  $(i, i)$  box in  $A' \cup B'$  is filled with  $b$ . It means that the westernmost  $(i, i)$   $b$ -box in  $B$  is not affected by  $\sigma^k$ . On the other hand, no boxes are in the  $(i-1)$ st column of  $A \cup B$ , so the southernmost  $a'$ -box in the  $i$ th column of  $A$  has been moved to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box in  $A'$  through  $\sigma^k$ . Combining these properties yields that

$$\sigma^k(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B}) \approx A' \cup B' (\approx A'' \cup B'') \quad \text{up to } (i-1, i) \text{ and } (i, i).$$

The claim now follows from the fact that the  $(i-1, i)$  box and  $(i, i)$  in  $\sigma^k(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B})$  are  $a$  and  $b'$ , respectively.

Finally, in case where  $\tilde{\sigma} = (S6')$  is applied to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box in  $A'$ ,  $(\widehat{A}, \widehat{B})$  can be obtained in a similar way as in the second case. In this case, the  $(i, i+1)$  box may be or may not be in  $A \cup B$ . In any case, it can be easily seen that the westernmost  $(i, i)$   $b$ -box in  $B$  is not affected by  $\sigma^k$  and the southernmost  $a'$ -box in the  $i$ th column of  $A$  has been moved to the  $(i-1, i)$   $a'$ -box in  $A'$  through  $\sigma^k$ .  $\square$

From now on, we will use the notation  $\widetilde{\Sigma}$  to distinguish the modified shifted switching process from the shifted switching process. For a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$  we will write  $\widetilde{A}_B$  for  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)^{(a)}$  and  $\widetilde{A}\widetilde{B}$  for  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)^{(b)}$ . We also call the map  $\widetilde{\Sigma}$  obtained via this process *the modified shifted tableau switching*.

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be SYTs consisting of  $\mathbf{a}$ -boxes and  $\mathbf{b}$ -boxes, respectively. Define  $\omega(A)$  by the SYT obtained by priming the southwesternmost box in  $A$ . Recall that  $(a')'$  is set to be  $a$ . In Particular, for  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$ , define  $\Omega(A, B)$  by  $(\omega(A), \omega(B))$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Suppose that  $(A, B)$  is a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . If  $\Sigma(A, B)$  is not equal to  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$ , then we have*

- (a)  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B) = \Sigma \circ \Omega(A, B)$ .
- (b)  $\Omega \circ \widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B) = \Sigma(A, B)$ , or equivalently,  $\Omega \circ \Sigma = \Sigma \circ \Omega$ .

**Proof.** (a) The proof of Proposition 6.1(b) shows that if a modified switch is applied to  $\sigma^k(A, B)$  for some  $k \geq 0$  then

$$\tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B) = \sigma^{k+1}(\omega(A), \omega(B)). \quad (4)$$

By Proposition 6.1(a), only nonmodified switches can be applied to either side of (4). Therefore we can conclude that

$$\sigma^l \circ \tilde{\sigma} \circ \sigma^k(A, B) = \sigma^l \circ \sigma^{k+1}(\omega(A), \omega(B)) \quad \text{for all } l \geq 0.$$

(b) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \circ \Sigma \circ \Omega(A, B) &= \Omega \circ \Sigma(\omega(A), \omega(B)) \\ &= \Omega(\omega^{(\omega(A))} \omega(B), \omega(A)_{\omega(B)}) \\ &= (\omega(\omega^{(\omega(A))} \omega(B)), \omega(\omega(A)_{\omega(B)})). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Sigma(A, B) \neq \widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$  by assumption, the switches (S3), (S4) and (S7) cannot occur in the modified shifted switching process. This again implies that they cannot occur in the shifted switching process, too. In particular, since neither (S4) nor (S7) is not used in obtaining  $({}^A\omega(B), A_{\omega(B)})$  from  $(A, \omega(B))$ , the southwesternmost box in  $A$  is moved to that in  $A_{\omega(B)}$  by Lemma 3.13 and these boxes are both primed or both unprimed. It follows that  $\omega(A_{\omega(B)}) = \omega(A)_{\omega(B)}$ . In addition, since (S3) is not used in the shifted jeu de taquin of  $B$  depending on  $\omega(A)$ , the southwesternmost box in  $B$  is also moved to that in  $\omega^{(A)}B$  and these two boxes are both primed or both unprimed. This implies that  $\omega(\omega^{(A)}B) = \omega^{(A)}\omega(B)$ . Now combining Remark 3.7(iv) with the fact that  $\text{stan}(A) = \text{stan}(\omega(A))$  and  $\text{stan}(B) = \text{stan}(\omega(B))$ , we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega^{(A)}B &= \text{stan}(\omega(A))B = \text{stan}(A)B = {}^AB \quad \text{and} \\ A_{\omega(B)} &= A_{\text{stan}(\omega(B))} = A_{\text{stan}(B)} = A_B.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\Omega \circ \widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B) = \left( \omega(\omega^{(A)}\omega(B)), \omega(\omega(A)_{\omega(B)}) \right) = \left( {}^A\omega(B), A_{\omega(B)} \right) = ({}^AB, A_B).$$

□

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $(A, B)$  be a shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . Then we have*

- (a)  $\widetilde{A}_B \cup {}^B\widetilde{A}$  has the same shape as  $A \cup B$ .
- (b)  $\widetilde{A}_B$  extends  ${}^A\widetilde{B}$ . In addition,  $\widetilde{A}_B$  and  ${}^A\widetilde{B}$  are SSYT's of border strip shape.

**Proof.** (a) The assertion follows from the fact that neither a switch nor a modified switch does not affect on the shape.

(b) When  $\Sigma(A, B) = \widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$ , there is nothing to prove. When  $\Sigma(A, B) \neq \widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$ ,  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$  is equal to  $\Omega \circ \Sigma(A, B)$  by Lemma 6.2(b). It follows that  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)^{(a)}$  extends  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)^{(b)}$ . Since no primed letters are on the main diagonal in  $\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)$ , we obtain the desired result. □

The subsequent theorem shows that the set of pairs of SSYT's is invariant under the modified shifted tableau switching.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $(S, T)$  be a pair of SSYT's such that  $T$  extends  $S$ . The modified shifted tableau switching  $(S, T) \mapsto (\widetilde{S}T, \widetilde{S}T)$  satisfies the following.*

- (a)  $\widetilde{S}T \cup \widetilde{S}T$  has the same shape as  $S \cup T$ . In addition,  $\widetilde{S}T$  (resp.,  $\widetilde{S}T$ ) has the same weight as  $S$  (resp.,  $T$ ).
- (b)  $\widetilde{S}T$  extends  $\widetilde{S}T$ . In addition,  $\widetilde{S}T$  and  $\widetilde{S}T$  are SSYT's.

**Proof.** In view of Lemma 6.3, the proof can be done essentially in the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3.9. □

The following example illustrates how the modified shifted switching process works. Compare the result below with Example 3.10. Let

$$S = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & \\ & & 1 & 2' & \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & & \\ & 2 & & & \\ & & & & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & 1' & 1 \\ & & & 1' & \\ & & 1' & 1 & \\ & 2 & 2 & & \end{array}.$$

Applying the modified shifted switching process to  $(S^{(2)}, T^{(1)})$  in  $S^{(1)}S^{(2)}T^{(1)}T^{(2)}$  yields that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & \\ & & 2' & 1' & \\ 2 & 1' & 1 & & \\ & & & & \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S1')} \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & \\ & & 2' & 1' & \\ 1 & 2' & 1 & & \\ & & & & \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S1)} \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & \\ & & 2' & 1' & \\ 1 & 1 & 2' & & \\ & & & & \end{array} \xrightarrow{(S5)} \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & \\ & & 1' & 2' & \\ 1 & 1 & 2' & & \\ & & & & \end{array}.$$

Keeping the modified shifted switching process, we finally obtain

$$\widetilde{S}_T = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & 1' & 1 & 1 \\ & & 1 & 2 & \\ 1 & & 2 & & \\ & & & & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{S}_T = \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & 1 \\ & & & 1' & \\ & & 1' & 2' & \\ & 1 & 2' & & \end{array}.$$

**Remark 6.5.** In [18] Stembridge gave a combinatorial proof that Schur  $Q$ -functions are symmetric. To do this he showed that there is a content-reversing involution on the set of SYTs of a given shape, say  $\lambda$ . The set of SSYTs of shape  $\lambda$ , however, is not closed under this involution, thus Stembridge's method does not induce a combinatorial proof that Schur  $P$ -functions are symmetric.

We remark that our shifted tableau switching (Theorem 3.9) and modified shifted tableau switching (Theorem 6.4) also give a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of Schur  $Q$ - and Schur  $P$ -functions, respectively. To be precise we can define a content-reversing involution by switching the border strip formed by  $i, i'$  with the border strip formed by  $i+1, (i+1)'$  and then performing the interchanges  $i \leftrightarrow i+1, i' \leftrightarrow (i+1)'$ . It should be emphasized that the involution coming from our shifted tableau switching is different from Stembridge's involution. Also we remark that Cho [3] gave another combinatorial proof of the symmetry of Schur  $P$ -functions by giving a Bender-Knuth type involution on the set of semistandard decomposition tableaux.

The rest of this section is devoted to providing analogues of Theorem 4.3 and Example 4.8 for the modified shifted tableau switching. For  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda^+$ , the coefficients  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  appearing in

$$P_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_{\mu} g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu P_{\mu}(x) \quad \text{or} \quad Q_{\lambda}(x)Q_{\mu}(x) = \sum_{\nu} g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu Q_{\nu}(x)$$

are nonnegative integer coefficients since  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = 2^{\ell(\lambda)+\ell(\mu)-\ell(\nu)} f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  and  $\ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu) - \ell(\nu) \geq 0$  whenever  $f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu \geq 0$ .

To find an appropriate tableau model for these coefficients, we note that, for each  $i$ , the rightmost entry  $i$  of  $|w(T)|$  in Theorem 4.1(b) is unprimed. Indeed it was pointed out in [17, page 126] that the lattice property is unaffected when the primes of these extremal entries are changed arbitrarily. This shows that the number of SYTs of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  satisfying the lattice property is given

by  $2^{\ell(\mu)} f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$ . Since every entry on the main diagonal of  $T$  is an extremal entry, we see, consequently, that the number of SSYT of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  satisfying the lattice property is given by

$$\frac{2^{\ell(\mu)} f_{\lambda\mu}^\nu}{2^{\ell(\nu)-\ell(\lambda)}} (= g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu).$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  the set of SSYT of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  satisfying the lattice property. We call an SSYT in  $\mathcal{G}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$  a *modified Littlewood-Richardson-Stembridge (LRS) tableau*.

**Example 6.6.** (a) Let  $\lambda = (4, 2)$ ,  $\mu = (4, 3, 1)$  and  $\nu = (6, 5, 2, 1)$ . Then there are exactly eight modified LRS tableaux of shape  $\nu/\lambda$  and weight  $\mu$  as follows:

|                                                                                   |                                                                                 |                                                                                  |                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| $\begin{array}{cc} & 1' & 1 \\ & 1 & 1 & 2' \\ 2 & 2 & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 2' & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$  | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1' & 2' & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$  |
| $\begin{array}{cc} & 1' & 1 \\ & 1' & 1 & 2' \\ 2 & 2 & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2' & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1 & 2' & 2 \\ 1 & 2' & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} & 1 & 1 \\ & 1' & 2' & 2 \\ 1 & 2' & & \\ & 3 & & \end{array}$ |

Therefore  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = 8$ .

(b) For  $\nu \in \Lambda^+$ ,  $g_{\emptyset\nu}^\nu = 1$  and the corresponding modified LRS tableau is  $R_\nu$ .

**Theorem 6.7.** Suppose that  $S$  and  $T$  are SSYT such that  $T$  extends  $S$ . If the modified shifted tableau switching transforms  $(S, T)$  into  $(\widetilde{S}T, \widetilde{S}T)$ , then we have the following.

- (a) The modified shifted tableau switching transforms  $(\widetilde{S}T, \widetilde{S}T)$  into  $(S, T)$ .
- (b) When  $T$  is a modified LRS tableau, so is  $\widetilde{S}T$ .
- (c) When  $S$  is a modified LRS tableau, so is  $\widetilde{S}T$ .

**Proof.** (a) It is enough to show that  $\widetilde{\Sigma} \circ \widetilde{\Sigma}(A \cup B) = A \cup B$  for any shifted perforated  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ -pair  $(A, B)$  such that  $B$  extends  $A$ . If a modified switch is not used in the modified shifted switching process, the assertion follows from Lemma 4.6. Otherwise, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Sigma}(\widetilde{A}B, \widetilde{A}B) &= \widetilde{\Sigma}(\widetilde{\Sigma}(A, B)) \\ &= \Sigma(\Omega(\Sigma(\Omega(A, B)))) && \text{(by Lemma 6.2(a))} \\ &= \Sigma(\Omega(\Omega(\Sigma(A, B)))) && \text{(by Lemma 6.2(b))} \\ &= \Sigma(\Sigma(A, B)) && \text{(since } \Omega \circ \Omega = \text{id)} \\ &= (A, B) && \text{(by Lemma 4.6)} \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

(b) Suppose that  $(S, T)$  is a pair of SSYTs such that  $T$  extends  $S$ . Denote by  $(S', T')$  any pair obtained by applying a sequence of shifted and modified switches to  $(S, T)$ . To prove our assertion, it suffices to show that  $w(T)$  is a lattice word if and only if  $w(T')$  is a lattice word. Notice that every word shifted Knuth equivalent to an LRS word is an LRS word by Lemma 4.7 and every word obtained by changing the primes of any rightmost letters is also a lattice word by [17, page 126], and hence one can immediately derive that every word shifted Knuth equivalent to a lattice word is a lattice word. Moreover, by Lemma 6.2(a),  $w(T')$  is obtained from  $w(T)$  by applying a sequence of shifted Knuth transformations and by priming some rightmost letters if necessary. This shows that  $w(T)$  is a lattice word if and only if  $w(T')$  is a lattice word.

(c) Let  $S$  be a modified LRS tableau. From (b) it follows that  $\widetilde{S}_T$  is a modified LRS tableau if and only if  $\widetilde{\widetilde{S}_T}$  is a modified LRS tableau. Now the assertion is straightforward by (a).  $\square$

**Example 6.8.** Let  $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Lambda^+$  with  $\lambda, \mu \subseteq \nu$ .

(a) (The modified shifted Littlewood-Richardson rule) By Theorem 6.7 we obtain a bijection

$$\Sigma : \mathcal{G}_{\emptyset\lambda}^\lambda \times \mathcal{Y}(\nu/\lambda) \rightarrow \bigcup_{\mu \subseteq \nu} \mathcal{Y}(\mu) \times \mathcal{G}_{\mu\lambda}^\nu, \quad (R_\lambda, T) \mapsto \left( \widetilde{R_\lambda T}, (\widetilde{R_\lambda})_T \right).$$

This immediately gives a combinatorial interpretation of  $P_{\nu/\lambda}(x) = \sum_\mu g_{\mu\lambda}^\nu P_\mu(x)$ .

(b) (Symmetry of the modified shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficients) By Theorem 6.7 we obtain a bijection

$$\Sigma : \mathcal{G}_{\emptyset\lambda}^\lambda \times \mathcal{G}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{\emptyset\mu}^\mu \times \mathcal{G}_{\mu\lambda}^\nu, \quad (R_\lambda, T) \mapsto \left( R_\mu, \widetilde{(R_\lambda)_T} \right).$$

Hence, not only have we proven  $g_{\lambda\mu}^\nu = g_{\mu\lambda}^\nu$ , we have constructed an explicit involution that interchanges the inner shape with the weight of a modified LRS tableau.

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Benkart, F. Sottile, J. Stroomer, *Tableau switching: algorithms and applications*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **76** (1996), 11–43.
- [2] A. S. Buch, A. Kresch, H. Tamvakis, *Littlewood-Richardson rules for Grassmannians*, Adv. Math. **185** (2004), 80–90.
- [3] S. Cho, *Littlewood-Richardson rule for Schur P-functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), 939–972.
- [4] S.-I. Choi, S.-Y. Nam, Y.-T. Oh, *Bijections among combinatorial models for shifted Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **128** (2014), 56–83.
- [5] W. Fulton, *Young tableaux, with applications to representation theory and geometry*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- [6] D. Grantcharov, J. H. Jung, S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, M. Kim, *Crystal bases for the quantum queer superalgebra and semistandard decomposition tableaux*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), 457–489.
- [7] M. D. Haiman, *On mixed insertion, symmetry, and shifted Young tableaux*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **50** (1989), 196–225.

- [8] G. James, A. Kerber, *The representation theory of the symmetric group*, in *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*, Vol. 16, Addison-Wesley Reading, MA, 1981.
- [9] T. Lam, A. Lauve, F. Sottile, *Skew Littlewood-Richardson rules from Hopf algebras*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2011** (2011), 1205–1219.
- [10] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, second ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
- [11] J. Remmel, *The combinatorial  $(k, l)$ -hook Schur functions*, Contemp. Math. **34** (1984), 253–287.
- [12] B. E. Sagan, *Shifted tableaux, Schur  $Q$ -functions, and a conjecture of R. Stanley*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **45** (1987), 62–103.
- [13] M. P. Schützenberger, *Quelques remarques sur une construction de Schensted*, Canad. J. Math. **13** (1961), 117–128.
- [14] M. P. Schützenberger, *Promotion des morphismes d'ensembles ordonnés*, Discrete Math. **2** (1972), 73–94.
- [15] L. Serrano, *The shifted plactic monoid*, Math. Z. **266** (2010), 363–392.
- [16] M. Shimozono, *Littlewood-Richardson rules for ordinary and projective representations of symmetric groups*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, San Diego, 1991.
- [17] J. R. Stembridge, *Shifted tableaux and the projective representations of symmetric groups*, Adv. Math. **74** (1989), 87–134.
- [18] J. R. Stembridge, *On symmetric functions and the spin characters of  $S_n$* , Topics in algebra, **26**, Part 2, (1988), 433–453.
- [19] D. R. Worley, *A theory of shifted Young tableaux*, Ph.D. thesis, MIT, 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 08826, KOREA

*E-mail address:* ignatioschoi@snu.ac.kr

SCHOOL OF COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES, KIAS, SEOUL 02455, KOREA

*E-mail address:* synam@kias.re.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOGANG UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 04107, KOREA

*E-mail address:* ytoh@sogang.ac.kr